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With this publication, the distinguished Hebraist Ernst Jenni offers a significant contribution to the conversation of Biblical Hebrew. This work is a collection of select writings, many previously published in journals or Festschriften. While there is continuity in the collection, one may choose to read each chapter independently, depending on one’s research interest.

The first three articles pull together some of Jenni’s analyses on time. The first, *Adverbiale Zeitbestimmungen im klassischen Hebräisch*, argues that the distinction must be made between deitic and non-deitic categories using *langue*. This argument flows nicely into the second article, *Temporale Angaben im Sacharjahbuch*. Here, Jenni uses Zechariah as a testing ground for the usefulness of a deitic/non-deitic distinction. For example, he makes an argument that one adverbial phrase “in that day” provides structural marker for the book of Zechariah. In the third article on time, *Bewertete Zeitbestimmungen*, Jenni attempts to demonstrate that the speaker in the Hebrew Bible can and does distinguish perception and reality with certain adverbs.

Jenni then shows his skills of categorization by placing many verbs and adjectives with comparisons into his compartments in *Untersuchungen zur Komparation im hebräischen Alten Testament*. The categories that Jenni uses help the student think carefully about how a verb or adjective functions. This article leads nicely to the next study of adjectives, *Adjektive und Eigenschaftsverben im Althebräischen*. Here, Jenni brings thoughts from his *Piel* monograph and lays the ground work for the lengthy essay that concludes the present collection of essays. He argues that predicate adjectives bring new information to the sentence while verbs of quality give already known information.

Next, there are three articles that focus on style and modality. The first article, *Sprachliche Überreibung im Alten Testament*, continues to show Jenni’s skill of categorization; here, he classifies rhetoric and hyperbole (e.g., numerical exaggeration of people as numerous as sand). In the following article, *Psalm 30:6a—eine ungewöhnliche Sentenz*, he argues that the *beth* in this sentence brings a modal idea, rather than being a simple copula. There is a relationship between “his anger” and “a moment,” for which the *beth* provides evidence. The modal function that Jenni espouses, however, is not common in the Old Testament. The last brief article, *Erwägungen zur Etymologie der althebräischen Modalpartikel nā‘*, stays with the theme of modality. Jenni discusses the often interesting and perplexing etymology and meaning of *nā‘*. After arguing that suppositions of Gesenius and Gottlieb are unconvincing because of hypothetical nature, Jenni points to the modal context and function of the particle as the most demonstrable aspect of *nā‘*.

The primary contribution of the present work is the final essay, *Nif’al und...*
Hitpa`el im Biblisch-Hebräischen, which has not been published elsewhere. Here, Jenni brings together his methodological rigor and prior studies on adjectives (e.g., chapter 5 of present work) and verbs (e.g., Das hebräische Piel monograph and Zur Funktion der reflexiv-passiven Stammform in Studien II). He argues by analogy of adjectives that the niphal expresses information that is expected (i.e., not new), but the hithpael expresses information that the addressee does not know (i.e., new information). He makes his argument of expected vs. new information on text-pragmatic grounds. Jenni brings his distinctions between hiphil (i.e., causative) and piel (i.e., factitive) to bear on niphal and hithpael, respectively.

Jenni contends that niphal and hithpael do not function reflexively. This argument of non-reflexive niphal and hithpael goes against the (at least former) scholarly consensus of both stems having predominant reflexive meaning. Part of the problem for understanding the verbal stems according to Jenni, however, is the target language (e.g., German). To be sure, there is co-reference in both stems. He describes this co-reference, however, as middle—not reflexive—because the object is undifferentiated. In fact, Jenni finds Hebrew displaying a middle feature by prefixes for both stems.

What is more, Jenni eschews the standard discussion of passive meaning in these stems in order to show how context activates one of the many semantic possibilities of a stem. For example, the niphal could express an achievement or a tolerative meaning; context, however, must determine the meaning—not the stem itself. It is helpful to note here that Jenni picks up from his updated study on piel (see Studien II) with Vendler’s Aktionsarten categories to analyze niphal and hithpael stems.

The final and most important study stretches almost one hundred and seventy pages. Here, Jenni adds clarity to two stems: niphal and hithpael. He does so by interacting with recent dissertations, monographs, and his own work. In classic Jenni fashion, he argues for a clear understanding on Hebrew verbs (e.g., given vs. new information in Gen 3:8 and Gen 3:10, respectively), even if the target language cannot demonstrate certain nuances well. Jenni’s clear organization, argumentation, and examples (especially the semantic chart of verbs, 287-95) make his work easy to read and reference.

Jenni provides students of the Hebrew Bible a resource filled with his mature and sharp insights. Certainly one would not agree with every point Jenni makes, but the sophistication of linguistics, Hebrew syntax, and nearly exhaustive analyses make this book a contribution to the field that will cause scholars to think more clearly about various syntactical, temporal, and etymological issues. One, however, may criticize his methods of analysis in Nif`al und Hitpa`el. For example, readers may question Jenni’s use of Vendler’s Aktionsarten, the absence of Sirach and Qumran within the data studied, the absence of verbs occurring less than twenty times, and the claim that the prefixes of the stems function as middle markers. These criticisms do not minimize the work, however. Students of Biblical Hebrew should consult Jenni’s essays; scholars should carefully consider the Nif`al und Hitpa`el essay because this study challenges the typical way introductory and reference grammars discuss the verbal stems. This entire collection of Jenni’s work further emphasizes that it is truly an exciting time for the study of Biblical Hebrew.

Ethan Jones
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

This is a monograph of the author's dissertation at Yeshiva University where he is now a faculty member. The core of the book is a semantic discussion of several terms found for cutting in the Hebrew Bible (e.g. blade, axe, saw, sword, etc.). The author concludes with his model of the lexicalized words into a linguistic system. The book consists of an introductory and concluding chapter with six chapters discussing various groupings of working tools.

Chapter 1 introduces the author's methodology. He is studying the conceptual world of cutting tools by using the semantic field approach. He defines a semantic field as a group of words that are “supposed to map a section of the lexicon corresponding to some part of the real world” (15). He notes the paradigm shift in lexical study of Biblical Hebrew that is now incorporating “more methodologically-oriented” approaches.

Chapters 2 to 6 contain the core research of the project. Each chapter focuses on a specific domain of cutting tools in ancient Israel. The topics are: “Vocabulary of Woodworking” (Chapter 2), “Agricultural Tools” (Chapter 3), “Masonry” (Chapter 4), “The Semantic Field of Herev” (Chapter 5), and “Razors and Scribes Knives” (Chapter 6). Each chapter provides a lexicon of the various words and a discussion of these terms. Koller uses the biblical text as his basis, but also notes lacuna. For example, in the discussion of woodworking, he notes that there are not specific texts that deal with the process of woodworking, but that these terms come up in various texts as secondary discussions. While the biblical text mentions woodworking tools, not all are mentioned, such as the chisel. In addition, he discusses the etymology of the word, a history of its usage, and comparative analysis with other Semitic and ancient languages. Evidence from the ancient Near East and archaeological data is also presented.

Chapter 7 addresses a unique word used once in the Bible (Gen 49:5) that is usually translated as “sword.” Koller provides a table of various translations and their merits. He concludes that, of the various theories, two of the etymologies are correct representing two histories of the use of the term. He proposes that the original term referred to a scalpel or blade used for circumcision and later became the generic term blade or its common translation of sword.

The conclusion provides the semantic field of “blades” in Biblical Hebrew. He concludes that there are two types of tools (single-axis and double axis). Within these two main types you have blades, as well as specific blades for various types of cutting (e.g. animate and inanimate objects, etc.).

Koller provides an excellent study on the definitions and use of cutting tools in ancient Israel. While most biblical scholars and historians (archaeologists) tend to focus on the function of the artifact as it is described in the text, Koller shows that there are more complex meanings based on other variables. Archaeologists tend to develop typologies based on functional analysis such as knife, ax, sword, etc. Koller points out that Biblical Hebrew also defines artifacts based on other variables such as the context of their use. In this particular study, variables include circumcision, ritual, and whether one is using the blade to cut crops or wood.

One of the problems with the work is the lack of a theoretical base or discus-

1Original is in Hebrew, transliteration by reviewer.
sion introducing the reader to the study of semantic fields. The value is that this work is a great help for linguistic analysis and Bible translation of the Old Testament. Koller introduces the reader to the contextual world of language noting that words do not have a solely functional meaning.

The monograph freely uses original language (e.g. Hebrew, Greek, Arabic) limiting its audience to the scholar and student who can use the original biblical texts. Nevertheless, the author does use transliterations and translations that the reader can easily follow the argumentation. He provides a bibliography (that includes articles in modern Hebrew) as well as indices for texts (biblical, Mishnah, DSS), words discussed, modern authors, as well as subjects.

Steven M. Ortiz
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary


This volume represents some of the most recent scholarship on some of the oldest New Testament texts. Professors at Reformed Theological Seminary, Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger seek to gather high-quality reflections and detailed investigations of the early textual transmission of the New Testament writings. An intentional emphasis of the volume is on both the scribal context and early textual history of the New Testament writings. Their overall goal is “to provide an inventory and some analysis of the evidence available for understanding the pre-fourth-century period of the transmission of the NT materials” (2). The structure of the volume reflects these primary concerns. Part one provides a series of essays on the textual and scribal culture of Early Christianity (chaps 1-4), part two devotes a chapter to the early text of each major section of the New Testament (chaps 5-13), and part three examines the early citation of the New Testament writings in the patristic period (chaps 14-21).

One distinctive feature of this volume is its careful attention to questions of method and recent debates within the discipline of textual criticism. The contributors are seeking to describe the shockwaves produced by the papyri manuscript discoveries of the last century. Though Hill and Kruger acknowledge that these manuscripts have an “automatic importance,” they also note that “their real significance for the discipline of NT textual criticism is currently controversial” (2). In addition to containing sacred text, the manuscripts also have a story to tell about their own checkered history and about those who produced and passed them along. This type of analysis involves “the study of the papyri as physical specimens, as scribal artifacts” (15).

Accordingly, the essays of part one seek to adumbrate the ways a keen attention to paratextual elements (those surrounding the actual text) can shed light on early scribal cultural, the actual textual transmission of the New Testament documents, and the study of Christian origins. Harry Gamble outlines the nature of the “book trade” in the Roman Empire at large and also the “early and lively private traffic in texts within and between far-flung Christian communities” (36). Moving to the manuscripts themselves, Scot Charlesworth highlights the consistent codex size and use of *nomina sacra* (an early and intentional abbreviation system) among early New Testament manuscripts. These are likely indications of “catholicity” and show signs of coordinated (yet still informal) consensus among the early churches.
Similarly, Larry Hurtado argues that there is “a distinguishable Christian reading-culture” among the early churches and that “early Christian manuscripts are direct artifacts of it” (49). After analyzing a variety of visual/artifactual features, Hurtado concludes that the manuscripts reflect a Christian “reading-culture” that involved “the enfranchising and affirmation of a diversity of social strata in the public reading and discussion of literary texts” (62). Kruger ends this section with a brief survey of early Christian attitudes toward the reproduction of the texts they held to be Scripture. In order to account fully for the complexity of the historical data, Kruger contends that the historian must allow the explicit testimony of early church leaders to inform the reconstruction of their actual practice in handling those texts.

In their editorial role, Hill and Kruger not only seek to account for fresh evidence but also recent developments in research and methodological approaches. For Hill and Kruger, the time is ripe for “at least a first attempt” to assess this new data and these new developments. In the process, they discuss and take positions on important text-critical areas. For example, they note the discussion regarding the difference between the “early text” and the “original text” (3-5). Acknowledging the “complexities involved in defining” the “original text” and taking into account recent arguments against the term, Hill and Kruger opt to define the goal of textual criticism as the pursuit of the “earliest text” and its transmission (e.g., 4). However, they do argue that “the concept of an original text” is not altogether incoherent and illegitimate (4). For them, there is no need “to relinquish the traditional goal of textual criticism (even if that goal cannot always be reached with the precision we desire)” (4).

Hill and Kruger also ask whether the most helpful text-critical category for new readings is “text type” or “type of text” (6-9). These two explanations of variants “have become fountainheads for two streams of analysis of the papyri which continue up to the present” (7). The traditional approach classifies patterns of readings into broad text types (Western, Alexandrian, etc.) based on characteristic features of the texts found in the major fourth century manuscripts. The early papyri evidence from the second and third centuries is then classified according to these broadly developed text types. An alternative approach (the “Münster approach”) classifies early manuscripts in three main groups (strict, normal, and free text) “according to how closely they mirrored the original or Ausgangstext—assumed for practical purposes to be the text now established by over a century of text critical work, the Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graecae” (9). Noting that this approach has received legitimate criticism (e.g., of “circularity”), they also recognize it as a valuable “working hypothesis” that is unobjectionable “at least as a point of departure” (9).

For Hill and Kruger, adopting this kind of starting point also helps respond to the assumption that the pre-fourth century was populated by wildly incompetent scribes roaming an uncontrolled textual wilderness. They observe that (according to the standard clarifications), “just under 73 percent of the earliest NT manuscripts” are classified as “normal to strict” texts, and conversely “just over 27 percent” are labeled as “free” (10-11). Accordingly, “what was previously, even by the Alands, dubbed the ‘living text’ of the early period now seems to have been ‘dead’ for nearly three-quarters of the scribes who copied it” (11).

Although the editors do not impose a particular methodology on the scholars presenting the chapters in the text-criticism section of part two, they do ask them to note the transmission quality of the texts in question in their analysis (using the classification system of the Münster approach). For Hill and Kruger, the inclusion of
this technical element is crucial because “these judgments constitute one significant datum which many researchers use in formulating judgments about the transmission of the NT text in the early period” (18). Part two provides text-critical analysis of the early texts of each of the New Testament books or groupings: Matthew (Tommy Wasserman), Mark (Peter Head), Luke (Juan Hernández), John (Juan Chapa), Acts (Christopher Tuckett), Paul/Hebrews (James Royse), the general epistles (J. K. Elliott), and Revelation (Tobias Nicklas). Peter Williams rounds out this section by surveying the translational technique of some of the early versions of the New Testament (e.g., Syriac versions) and the difficult task of discerning a translation’s Vorlage (underlying text).

After the historical and text-critical analysis of parts one and two, the volume ends with a series of literary studies on the early citation of the New Testament writings in the apostolic and patristic period. Hill provides a methodological discussion of the “methods and standards of literary borrowing” in this period (261-81). Patristic citations often receive prominence in the establishment of a “clear picture of an erratic NT text” (262). Because there are numerous loose quotations in the patristic literature, it is assumed, there must not have been a stable textual tradition. Hill points out that there is a difference between an author’s “manner of citation” and “the text behind the citations” (263). He also seeks to take “the literary environment in which Christian authors operated” as a starting point rather than modern standards of quotation (265ff).

After surveying citation examples from the wider literary culture, Hill argues that Christians did not represent a “special case” but they too cited even scriptural texts with a variety of methods (e.g., “loose” or adaptive citation). While taking account of the vagaries of the historical data, Hill posits that “the reading of an author’s NT exemplar from his citation always remains, in some authors more so than in others, and therefore the task must be pursued” (281). Accordingly, the essays that follow examine the citation and possible underlying text cited in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers (Paul Foster), Marcion (Dieter Roth), Justin Martyr (Joseph Verheyden), Tatian and his Diatessaron (Tjitze Baarda), the apocryphal Gospels (Stanley Porter), Irenaeus (D. Jeffrey Bingham and Billy Todd), and Clement of Alexandria (Carl Cosaert). These discussions of external evidence plow through most of the textual ground that traditional canon studies seek to harvest.

Hill and Kruger observe in their introduction that “there is currently an undeniable flowering of interest in many aspects of research on the text and the manuscript tradition of the New Testament documents” (1). On both a popular and a scholarly level, the discovery and reconstruction of the earliest manuscripts of the New Testament continues to garner wide interest. In light of this scenario, the editors establish a clear need for the type of analysis afforded in this volume. As they note, though the importance of the (apx.) 127 papyrus manuscript fragments is universally acknowledged, “their real significance for the discipline of NT textual criticism is currently controversial” (2).

One of the most valuable aspects of this volume is that it presents a bevy of technical data alongside of a general orientation to the issues that impinge upon the study of textual transmission (e.g., scribal culture and book production). Through the introduction, the first major section, and the methodological reflections in parts two and three, this volume provides the student of the New Testament text with a goldmine of information and also the tools to excavate that payload.

For instance, Tuckett provides a series of methodological cautions for those
piecing together a manuscript’s checkered textual landscape (157-60), and Williams discusses at length the critical importance of translational technique when reconstructing a translation’s underlying text (239-45). This type of preliminary exploration is common throughout the volume. The interpretation of fragmentary data is always informed by the given interpreter’s various methodological presuppositions, so these elements are welcome features of this collection.

Though the editors set parameters for the textual analysis, a clear diversity surfaces in the text-critical studies of part two. There are considerable differences in style, method, and analysis in each contributor’s contribution. For example, in his study of Matthew’s text, Wasserman adopts and interacts with the Münster approach at length. Other contributors, though, prefer to continue speaking of the various textual traditions as “text-types” (e.g., 115, 118, 128-30). Hernandez, for instance, includes the Alands’ category of “textual quality,” but he does so only “for the sake of convention” (139, cf. 157n3).

In terms of the presentation in part two, it would help if the headings and progression of the chapters were uniform. The “reading aids” for each entry are different. Royse uses Roman numerals in his chapter on Paul’s letters, and Wasserman uses the papyrus number + other classifications. Nicklas’ chapter on Revelation does not include a table, and Elliot’s table on the Catholic Epistles does not include the Alands’ “textual quality” category. Standardizing the shorthand used by various authors to indicate scribal activity (e.g. for additions or omissions) would also increase the cohesion of the text-critical studies.

Despite this diversity, each of the chapters has a table of text-critical results that includes the same elements (including an assessment of a given witness “textual quality”). Thus, this section serves as a rich resource for specialists and non-specialists (who will not detect/care about the subtle methodological differences). Further, even if the approaches were perfectly uniform, the chapters would still probably feel uneven because of the unevenness of the manuscript evidence being analyzed. For example, in Head’s chapter on Mark, P 45 is the only significant witness but is relatively insignificant for textual reconstruction. On the other hand, in his chapter on Luke, Hernandez shows how P 45 is a very significant witness for current scholarly editions of the third Gospel.

These features make this volume a timely contribution to the study of the earliest texts of the New Testament. As a novice of New Testament textual criticism, I found these chapters to be consistently engaging, always informative, and sometimes even exciting (if that is possible in a volume brimming with technical minutiae!). The story that the New Testament manuscripts tell is one that continues to unfold and take shape. These discussions are part of that documentary drama. Indeed, though certain elements will surely be dated quickly (e.g., new papyrus fragments are still being “uncovered”), the value of this volume will also surely endure for the foreseeable future. Because of its focus and methodological savvy, I think it would prove an excellent supplementary volume (or main textbook) in a course on contemporary textual criticism of the New Testament.

If you are a scholar sifting through these fragments or a student seeking an introduction to this area of the field, this volume is the “type of text” that you will want to keep within reach.

Ched Spellman
Cedarville University

F. Scott Spencer has a clever way with words, as his book titles reflect. He also wrote Dancing Girls, “Loose” Ladies, and Women of the “Cloth.” He can effectively paint a good description, such as, “Jesus effectively tars his homefolk as dubious power-grubbers and prophet-snubbers” (217), and he writes in an engaging style. Yet, at times his “cleverness” can be offensive, such as when he occasionally uses cuss words to emphasize a point (253, 341) or uses the disrespectful description of the Holy Spirit as “the wild child of the divine family.”

The evangelist Luke’s focus on women in his Gospel is well-known, but it is both interesting and disconcerting to see what erroneous interpretations feminist theologians derive from these Lukan passages. In this present book Spencer uses feminist biblical interpretation as his primary focus to examine the Lukan passages about women (ix). Thus, the vast majority of biblical interpreters that Spencer cites and evaluates in this book are feminist theologians, and he has voluminous footnotes to point the reader to further study in this area. A professor of New Testament and preaching at Baptist Theological Seminary in Richmond, Virginia, Spencer calls himself a “card carrying feminist” (viii) and believes feminist criticism is an essential element of proper critical biblical interpretation (viii–ix).

What is a feminist approach to Scripture? It involves approaching the text cautiously and skeptically because feminists believe it is “a text written by (dominant) men for men—that is, from a thoroughly androcentric (male-centered), patriarchal (father-rulled), and kyriarchal (master-dominated) perspective” (27). Its users parade a “hermeneutic of suspicion” concerning the biblical text (e.g., 38–40, 51) and try to determine what the author omitted, added, exaggerated, or changed. However, this reviewer believes this perspective has the approach backwards. Rather than the reader judging the Bible, the Bible—God’s inerrant Word—judges the reader.

Spencer views himself as a moderate feminist theologian, and his book bears this out as he eschews the more radical interpretations. For instance, he rejects Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza’s claim that Luke omitted Jesus’ encounter with the Syrophoenician woman (Mark 7:24–30) because it made Jesus look bad and because it showed a woman was partly responsible for the Gospel message going to Gentiles (210–11). Properly understood, this passage does not make Jesus look bad—nor does any other canonical passage. In the parable of the persistent widow and the unjust judge (Luke 18:1–8), Spencer disagrees with the typical feminist claim that Luke tamed the widow and recast her into a docile task of mere prayer: weak women’s work (265, 303–04). Thankfully, Spencer notes this wrong interpretation “fails to do justice to this vital spiritual activity” (305).

Yet, Spencer is often agreeable with the feminist perspective on these Lukan passages. He believes Luke muzzled women’s voices by failing to report what they said, with Luke 1–2 as an exception to the rule (118). Also, he sees most biblical texts

---


3 He quotes the term from Kalbryn A. McLean, “Calvin and the Personal Politics of Providence,” in Feminist and Womanist Essays in Reformed Dogmatics, ed. Amy Plantinga Pauw and Serene Jones (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 109. However, Spencer does seem to enjoy using the term (66, 71, 324).
as speaking to feminist issues no matter how tenuous that association may be. For instance, he somehow sees Mary’s willingness to bear the Messiah as confirmation of the position of the modern pro-choice movement (58, 75). These interpretations are troubling to this reviewer and are certainly at odds with traditional interpretation, but Spencer remains consistent with his focal point of feminist interpretation.

Deconstructing and reconstructing the biblical text is a mainstay in feminist interpretation, and Spencer practices this as his preferred method with a few nuances. He examines the Lukan passages in four areas: “place and occupation, voice and rhetoric, power and experience, and suspicion and trust” (ix). Although these can be helpful categories of examination, the perceived need to deconstruct and reconstruct the biblical text is flawed (9). It wrongly assumes the Gospel stories contain so many inaccuracies, erroneous emendations, and misleading elements that they must be ripped apart and reconstructed (39). Yet, such is not the case. They can be fully accepted in their present form.

There are many interpretive methods one may use when approaching the New Testament: grammatico-historical criticism, redaction criticism, narrative criticism, canonical criticism, liberation feminist criticism (37), and feminist criticism, to name a few. Although this reviewer is a strong proponent of the first one listed above, one ought to be familiar with what all of the other viewpoints have to say—not only to be aware of their deficiencies but also to see if they can add any positive tools to biblical studies. So, this present volume by Spencer is a helpful look at how feminist theologians interpret some specific biblical passages about women. Yet, the end result is that little information in this book is ultimately helpful for properly understanding these biblical passages. His primary contribution is his positive practice of closely examining a text to see if the surface meaning is really the intended meaning of the text.

James R. Wicker
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary


Interpreting the book of Hebrews is often an enigmatic enterprise for even the most skilled interpreter. Nevertheless, unforeseen treasures within Hebrews await anyone who labors diligently to uncover them. Such arduous endeavors now have a companion tool that attempts to alleviate the burden and address the gamut of issues in Hebrews. Herbert W. Bateman IV, formerly professor of New Testament at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, is current co-chair, along with Jon C. Laansma, of the Hebrews group of the Evangelical Theological Society. Bateman recently edited and contributed to a programmatic work entitled, Jesus the Messiah, along with Darrell L. Bock and Gordon H. Johnston, and thus is a duly qualified contributor to studies on Hebrews.

The present volume is part of the recent Kregel Charts of the Bible series, whose contents correspond to the concurrent companion tome devoted to the Pauline corpus. Bateman’s work encompasses four main sections: Part 1 focuses on introductory matters in Hebrews; Part 2 concentrates on the influences of the Old Testament and Second Temple Judaism within Hebrews; Part 3 centers on the

*Lars Kierspel, Charts on the Life, Letters, and Theology of Paul (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2012).*
theology of Hebrews; and Part 4 identifies the exegetical complexities of Hebrews.

Among the introductory matters charted in Part 1, Bateman surveys the history of proposals, with evidence for and against each through the centuries, from the earliest proposal of Tertullian (Barnabas), to Augustine (Paul), to middle-ages scholar Thomas Aquinas (Luke), and finally to present-day contributor G. H. Guthrie (Apollonius, 17–25). Bateman also addresses the ongoing foray as to the date of Hebrews whether pre or post-70 AD (41–45), the nature of the letter, whether understood as a sermonic or as a “mixed” Christian composition of exhortation (46–49) and the structure of the letter whether thematically, rhetorically, or text-linguistically arranged (53–58).

Part 2, “Old Testament and Second Temple Influences in Hebrews,” includes charts centering on citations and allusions of the Old Testament canon, the nature of the tabernacle in the original setting of Exodus and as recast in Hebrews, the cultic ritual system of Israel. In addition, Bateman draws on the primary sources to trace the priesthood of Judaism from the Aaronic to the Herodian era in order to show visually Jesus’ superiority as Divine Son and Regal High Priest from the order of Melchizedek (100–01). In Part 3, Bateman provides tabular portrayals of the theological themes in Hebrews, including comparisons between Jesus and the angelic hosts, and the emphasis on the concepts of covenant, inheritance, perfection, and rest (124–28, 130–32, and 135). Finally, Part 4 portrays interpretive issues such as the use of the Old Testament in the New, structural analysis, text-critical matters, and key words in Hebrews.

Bateman’s tome evokes several significant benefits. First, drawing on a vast amount of primary and secondary sources, he has managed to refine a considerable amount of data and visually encapsulate in one volume the heretofore-enigmatic issues of provenance, social history, structure, and theology relative to Hebrews. For the uninitiated layperson, Bateman offers a section-by-section guide near the end of his volume that helpfully explains the chart contents (239–53). Second, this volume contributes not only to those in the pew, but more importantly to the specialist in the academic setting since it would serve as an essential component of a course on Hebrews by enhancing instruction both within and outside the classroom. Third, the person predictably unaware of Second Temple history and literature particularly that of Qumran becomes cognizant of how such source material augments the Christological development in Hebrews. This aspect becomes especially apparent in the appearance of some Jewish exegetical practices employed by the author of Hebrews in his rich portrait of Jesus as divine Son, Messiah, and Priest-King.5

Finally, Bateman includes a helpful select bibliography at the end for further study.

Aside from its cumulative merit, the work contains a few minor defects. First, the organization seems slightly confusing since Bateman’s synopsis of the chart contents entitled, “Chart Comments,” follows the actual presentation. This synopsis of contents would seem better suited to precede and introduce the charts. Another negligible defect concerns the comparison between the Jewish ancestors in Hebrews 11 and the same referents in the extrabiblical sources 1 Maccabees 2:51–64 and Sirach 44–50 (Chart 82, 142). For example, among the Jewish ancestors listed in the chart, the Gentile woman Rahab appears (11:30). It is questionable whether the author of Hebrews intended Rahab as an example of proper Jewish ancestry. Her appearance more likely exemplifies the one people of God, namely, the faithful

Christian and spiritual ancestral heritage beyond ethnic Jewish distinctions.⁶

These negligible defects pale in light of the signal nature of Bateman’s careful composition. All interested in the study of Hebrews—layperson, pastor, theological student, and scholar alike—should procure this book for both personal and formal academic use. Thus, Bateman has made a signal contribution that will serve well the church and the academy for years to come.

Charles Martin
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

_Thomas and the Gospels: The Case for Thomas’s Familiarity with the Synoptics._

The _Gospel of Thomas_ is the king among noncanonical gospels—examined, discussed, and used by scholars today more than all other noncanonical gospels put together (1). It is also the darling among scholars who disparage the four canonical Gospels—sometimes called “the fifth gospel.”⁷ These academics typically place it earlier than the canonical Gospels, so they believe it is more chronologically accurate than the canonical Gospels. This early date is troubling since it does not mention the virgin birth or bodily resurrection of Jesus. In fact, the _Gospel of Thomas_ (hereafter, _Thomas_) has no narrative stories at all. It is just 114 disconnected sayings of Jesus.

Now a much-needed corrective view appears. Synoptic Gospels expert Mark Goodacre does a first-of-its-kind detailed study in _Thomas and the Gospels_ that demonstrates not only was _Thomas_ written after the Synoptic Gospels but was dependent upon them for sources. This is a noteworthy book with important ramifications for Gospel studies. Goodacre is an associate professor in New Testament at Duke University who has written widely on Synoptic Studies. He is known for promoting Markan priority as well as dispensing with the Q document.⁸

Goodacre wisely notes that all scholars can do at the present time is work with the extant copies of _Thomas_. A complete text exists only in the Coptic version, discovered at Nag Hammadi in 1945. Three Greek papyrus fragments remain, discovered at Oxyrhynchus, and it is in these Greek fragments that Goodacre finds some small verbatim quotations as well as some redaction (editorial reworking) of the Synoptic Gospels (27–29, 58, 61).

Goodacre believes the author of _Thomas_ “reworked material from the Synoptic Gospels in order to lend legitimacy to his sayings, to provide an authentic-sounding Synoptic voice for its secret, living Jesus” (vii). He begins the book by solidly answering the three most common arguments for the independence of _Thomas_ (9–25). Goodacre then sets out to prove that “the presence of Synoptic redactional material in _Thomas_ is frequent and significant” (57). He devotes chapter two to verbatim agreement. Chapter three describes the type of evidence: diagnostic

shards—small but important pieces. Chapters four through six examine Synoptic redactional material in *Thomas*. For each example he gives a helpful synopsis (side-by-side comparison) of the texts both in Greek (or Coptic) and English (e.g., 30, 35–36).

Sometimes Goodacre’s work has overly-ambitious redaction claims, such as the belief that Matthew’s parable of the enemy sowing tares among the wheat (Matt 13:24–30) is a reworking of Mark’s parable of the seed growing secretly (Mark 4:26–29) (73–80). Yet, those are clearly two different parables with two separate meanings. However, for the most part Goodacre’s evidence is insightful and compelling that *Thomas* used and reworked some Synoptic Gospel material. He speculates the author of *Thomas* used this material to try to give his gospel legitimacy so that he could then present his more unusual material.

Although Goodacre’s presentation is quite detailed, he does a good job in giving helpful comparisons when needed. He illustrates ancient literary dependence by discussing modern results of plagiarism percentages on student papers (45, 54–56). When he draws large conclusions on what may seem like small grammatical details, he reminds the reader of modern-day crimes that are solved by DNA from a single strand of hair (54). He searches for grammatical diagnostic shards, named after pottery shards that an archaeologist will unearth and find helpful for dating a certain level of an archeological dig (56).

Goodacre dates *Thomas* in the mid-second century AD (171). Thus, Goodacre’s research is an important argument against the claim that *Thomas* predates the Synoptic Gospels and contains material closer to the original events. Instead, Goodacre dates it over a hundred years after Jesus’ crucifixion and resurrection.

Part of Goodacre’s argument is based on Markan priority and that Matthew reworked Mark and then Luke reworked Mark and Matthew (18–22). Although many New Testament scholars affirm Markan priority, this reviewer finds potential problems with such a view.9 However, even if Goodacre is wrong on this issue, he still plainly points out that the author of *Thomas* used the Synoptic Gospels and not vice versa. This is an important work both for Gospel of *Thomas* studies as well as Synoptic studies from which both scholars and Bible students can benefit.

James R. Wicker
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary


To begin, this book does not seek to define biblical theology (BT) or to assert what it should be, but rather to describe how BT is understood presently by scholars in the field. The book functions as a sort of survey of the field. Klink and Lockett begin with a cursory discussion of the history of the field, beginning, of course, with Gabler in 1787. They point out that Gabler’s enterprise was a historical one, which divorced BT and systematic theology as well as the Old and New Testament. Next, Klink and Lockett go on to name several issues which must be given attention in BT: the Old Testament’s connection to the New Testament; historical diversity

---

vs. theological unity; the scope and sources of biblical theology; and whether the enterprise is an academic or confessional one.

The book describes five different types of BT. The authors suggest one view them as points on a continuum. At one end of the continuum is the historical and at the other is the theological point of view. While they admit that they have simplified the matter into five parts, they manage to devote a chapter to describing the BT of a scholar to go with each of the five types of BT. The first type of BT, what they label BT1, is called BT as historical description. James Barr is used as an example of this viewpoint. Klink and Lockett point out that Krister Stendahl advanced the idea that BT should be primarily a descriptive project. This position denies the normative nature of BT (31), and confines BT to the academic realm. If BT has any significance for the church it is because the preacher has translated from “what it meant” (BT) to “what it means” (for the church at present). The second type of BT, labeled BT2, is called history of redemption. D.A. Carson is chosen to represent this viewpoint. According to Klink and Lockett, the OT and NT relate because each of them describe redemptive history. This special history provides the theological unity between the diverse historical documents. Some adherents to this view seek to build a theology by examining first the Pauline writings, and then the other writers of the NT to see what they have in common. In this view, the church makes frequent use of the BT constructed in the academy. It is a bridge discipline between exegesis and systematic theology. The third type of BT, labeled BT3, is called worldview-story and is represented by N.T. Wright. Klink and Lockett describe BT3 as assuming the relationship between the OT and the NT exists as a narrative unity. The diversity of the different historical narratives are brought together under the unifying light of Jesus Christ, and therefore connected to the present-day church. The canonical approach is labeled BT4; and, not surprisingly, Brevard Childs is used to illustrate this viewpoint. The idea of canon binds the two testaments together as a unity, and limits the study of biblical theology. The subject is a confessional one, and the sources are the text of the canon and nothing else. Finally, theological construction is labeled BT5 with Francis Watson chosen as its representative. Precedence is given to the NT in study and in finding a unity in BT. The confessional nature of the enterprise is non-negotiable.

This book accomplishes its purpose of providing a short overview of different approaches to constructing BT. This work is suited for use in teaching a beginner level course on BT. This is not a reference work, but an introduction. In light of this, Understanding Biblical Theology is much more up to date than Hasel’s Basic Issues in the Current Debate but accomplishes the same sort of purpose which is to give one a framework for understanding contemporary BT. While Klink and Lockett’s work is not for an advanced audience as is Brueggemann’s Old Testament Theology: An Introduction; it is more useful for understanding contemporary approaches. Klink and Lockett are not concerned much with approaches to BT in history, as only five pages deal with historical development of the discipline. In fact, the work seems to cater to those who want to engage biblical theology for preaching and teaching rather than rigorous historical study. One would expect an introductory text to include more of a historical discussion than is given, though certainly less than Hayes and Prussner’s Old Testament Theology. One glaring weakness is a lack of attention given to John Sailhamer in the section on the Canonical Approach (BT4), who certainly contributes to that discussion. Furthermore, the five viewpoint approach as presented makes it difficult to understand where someone like Walter
Brueggemann’s *Theology of the Old Testament* fits into the continuum between the historical and theological views. Furthermore, postmodern approaches to BT such as Leo Perdue’s *Reconstructing Old Testament Theology* do not quite fit into the historical description view of BT1, though it appears to be the closest fit. In spite of these weaknesses the work of Klink and Lockett functions well as an introductory text and can be recommended as such.

Justin Allison  
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

### Historical Studies


The first impression a reader might get from the title of this book is that it is a cookbook of the Bible or that it is about food during Bible times. The book does not say much about the types of food used during the biblical period, nor for that matter, cooking. The book is actually a monograph about reconstructing domestic space in Iron Age settlements. It is an archaeological monograph that is an update of the author’s dissertation that contributes to the sub-discipline of household archaeology.

The first chapter discusses Shafer-Elliott’s theoretical approach using Goody’s food-preparation paradigm. This is the chapter that introduces her theoretical framework and thesis for her work. The emphasis is on the process of food production and consumption. Ironically not much has been done on food preparation in biblical times. The emphasis has been on the dietary laws of the Old Testament or the agrarian nature of the Israelite settlement. Shafer-Elliott correctly notes that any study of food in ancient Israel needs to develop a robust interplay between the biblical texts and the nature of the archaeological record.

The next chapters discuss settlement classification and a spatial analysis of Iron II Judahite settlements. This chapter consists of two parts. The first part is an analysis of settlement terms found in the Old Testament (e.g. city/town, village, farmstead). The second part is site settlement hierarchy as defined by social scientists (e.g. archaeologists and anthropologists). Shafer-Elliott notes that the biblical text defines settlements as fortified vs. unfortified while archaeologists define settlements based on their size. She proposes, rightfully so, that biblical scholars and archaeologists should define settlements based on the following criteria: 1) royal settlements (capitals), 2) fortified settlements, 3) unfortified settlements, and 4) farmsteads.

Chapter 3 continues the discussion of spatial analysis with an emphasis on the archaeological data. The author focuses the research on four sites (Lachish, Halif, Khirbet er-Ras, and Pisgat Ze’ev); providing an extensive archaeological description of the sites and a distribution of the four major types of cooking pots/jugs and cooking installations. She makes an interesting observation: domestic homes in cities/fortified settlements had larger cooking vessels than those homes in rural settlements. This pattern was unexpected as we would assume the larger rural domestic quarters housed larger extended family units versus the smaller homes in the city that would have a smaller family unit. The tentative conclusion is that the smaller cooking vessels are best for boiling cereals—perhaps implying that those in the city ate more meat vs. cereals in the rural areas.

Chapter 4 looks at ethnographic studies and ancient Near Eastern literature
and art to assist in reconstructing cooking practices. She notes that baking among modern Middle Eastern cultures provides one of the best avenues for data.

Chapter 5 will probably be the most informative chapters for pastors and teachers. The author analyzes four texts (Gen 18:1-8, 25:29-34, Judg 6:19-21, and 2 Sam 13:5-10) from the Old Testament that focus on food preparation in domestic contexts. While these are unusual circumstances (e.g. Abraham meeting “angels,” Tamar confronting her father in law, Amnon, Gideon meeting his divine visitor, and Jacob deceiving his father to obtain his brother’s birthright); insights into food preparation and its role in hospitality is provided. One of the most insightful is that both men and women were involved in food preparation.

Shafer-Elliott’s monograph is an important contribution for household archaeology during the biblical period. Looking at only four case studies each for archaeology and the biblical texts is a weakness of the study. Nevertheless, the research is innovative and will offer new avenues of research for the biblical historian and biblical archaeologists. Unfortunately, this book is inaccessible for most biblical scholars, students, and pastors. A more useful book would be What Did the Ancient Israelites Eat? Diet in Biblical Times by Nathan MacDonald (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008).

Steven M. Ortiz
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary


In *Early Christian Thinkers*, Paul Foster assembles a collection of essays that summarize the contributions of some of the most pivotal figures in early Christianity from 150-330 AD. The contributors represent a collection of well-respected patristic scholars and each essay evaluates key aspects of the life and theology of twelve Christian thinkers including: Justin, Tatian, Irenaeus, Theophilus of Antioch, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Perpetua, Origen, Cyprian of Carthage, Hippolytus of Rome, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Eusebius of Caesarea. While there are other Christian thinkers in this formative period of the church, Foster argues that these individuals made “innovative contributions towards developing Christian thought, theology and piety” (xi). The legacy of these fathers, according to Foster, calls believers in the modern age “to engage one’s intellect in the fullest pursuit of truth, in the confident hope that honest enquiry is always of the highest benefit for Christian faith” (xx).

The book progresses along these lines. Beginning in chapter 1, Paul Parvis commences the volume with a description of Justin’s life and writings. He underscores Justin’s resourcefulness in reworking the form of the governmental petition into an apology for the faith and summaries the importance of his *Logos* Christology. He even makes the interesting suggestion that Justin’s second apology comprises the “out-takes” of the first, which were collected and arranged by his students after his death (8). In chapter 2 the volume editor, Paul Foster, discusses the life and thought of Tatian beginning with Tatian’s tenuous relationship to Justin and his founding of Encaertite heresy. Foster describes the composition and transmission issues of Tatian’s apologetic work, the Oratio ad Graecos, and his Gospel harmony, the Diatessaron. In chapter 3, Denis Minns provides a balanced treatment of Irenaeus’
life and thought. He classifies Irenaeus' contribution into a series of key themes including the rule of faith and doctrine of recapitulation. He closes by reflecting on the re-emergence of interest in Irenaeus after the Reformation. In chapter 4, Rick Rogers introduces Theophilus of Antioch and his principle work To Autolycus. He argues that this work is an example of "protreptic literature," which was a type of persuasive rhetoric (58). The document is framed into three separate sections (Homilia, Syngramma, and Hypomnema), which move the reader progressively toward a mature understanding of the faith. In chapter 5 Judith Kovacs reviews of Clement of Alexandria's life, writings, and theology. She situates him in Alexandria as the head of a Christian philosophical school and explains the broad patterns of his theological trilogy: Exhortation (Protreptikos), Instructor (Paidagogos), and Miscellaneous (Stromateis). She organizes Clement's theological contribution under a series of basic theological questions that culminate in a discussion of his views on spiritual progress toward the divine likeness. Everett Ferguson treats Tertullian in chapter 6 and focuses on his role as the father of Latin Christianity, his extensive litany of writings, and his theological contribution. He also provides a detailed summary the main trajectories of Tertullian's theology and concludes with a survey of the major approaches to the academic study of Tertullian. In chapter 7 Sara Parvis introduces Perpetua and the account of her martyrdom. She develops several aspects of Perpetua's theology and focuses particularly on her understanding of the family of God. Rebecca Lyman describes the life and writings of Origen in chapter 8. She summarizes his extensive collection of commentaries, homilies, and other theological and polemical writings, and gives a detailed analysis of his major work On First Principles. She also discusses some of his theological perspectives on theodicy, his doctrines of revelation, incarnation, and salvation. In chapter 9 J. Patout Burns describes the contribution of Cyprian of Carthage and gives special attention to his emphasis on the unity and purity of the church. Then, in chapter 10 Ulrich Volp reviews the contribution of Hippolytus of Rome and disentangles the various issues of authorship related to the Hippolytan literary corpus. He also describes the relationship between his polemical writings, liturgical texts, and biblical commentaries. Michael Slusser introduces Gregory Thaumaturgus in chapter 11 and argues for a maximalist position regarding his body of work. As a student of Origen, Thaumaturgus follows the general aspects of Origen's theology and emphasis on the philosophic life. Finally, Timothy Barns concludes the volume with an essay on Eusebius of Caesarea that situates his contribution within the theological controversies of the fourth century. He provides a helpful thematic organization of Eusebius' writings and concludes with a summary of his views of God in history that guided his historiography.

Taken together, this collection of essays is a useful introduction to some of the most important figures in early Christianity. Each chapter concludes with a bibliography that contains the editions and translations of their works, as well as a selection of essential secondary publications for further study. However, as often happens in a collection of essays, some of the contributions are more idiosyncratic or address critical issues that are beyond the scope of introductory material. Most essays have different formats and emphases and use distinctive headings and topics, which gives the volume less coherence. In a certain respect this is understandable given that the study of each of these theologians has its own unique theological and literary issues. The volume would also benefit from a conclusion that might reflect upon some aspects of continuity and discontinuity between their contributions. Nevertheless, despite some of these weaknesses this volume provides a solid introduction to these
pivotal figures in early Christianity written by proven scholars in early Christian studies. It would fit nicely into any introductory course on early Christianity, especially if it was coupled with other primary readings.

Stephen O. Presley
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary


Thomas Oden is well-known for reviving ancient traditions. He is the general editor for the popular series, Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture and Ancient Christian Texts, which provides translations of patristic interpretations of Scripture. He regularly defends the value of studying ancient traditions for the benefit of the modern church (i.e. The Rebirth of Orthodoxy). His work in historical theology is also informed by an extensive list of theological and pastoral publications including a four-volume set on the teachings of John Wesley, a three-volume systematic theology, and a number of popular works on practical theology and devotional guides.

In recent years, however, Oden has focused his research agenda on the early Christian traditions of the African continent. He has already published How Africa Shaped the Christian Mind: Rediscovering the African Seedbed of Western Christianity and Early Libyan Christianity: Uncovering a North African Tradition. Now in The African Memory of Mark, Oden revives and retells the complex portrait of Mark the evangelist, Gospel writer, and interpreter of Peter. Going against the tide of contemporary biblical scholarship, he argues that the roots of African Christianity lie in Mark and believes that the time has come for many (especially those in the Global South and others interested in African Christianity) to benefit from the stories of Mark’s early evangelistic efforts. According to Oden the “African popular memory of Mark is very different from the Western memory” (23) that developed from the critical methods disseminating from Harnack and Bauer (183-4, 254). Biblical scholars in the West have largely concluded that Mark was Palestinian not African and assumed that many of the African narratives surrounding Mark are unreliable accounts. Oden, on the other hand, draws upon the Ricoeurian notion of a “second naiveté” and approaches the life and writings of Mark from a perspective of historiography that reads Mark “within the specific experience and outlook of the continent of Africa” (27). In doing so, he weaves together an eclectic blend of ancient legends, biblical texts, archeology, artwork, and literary sources that paint a fuller portrait of the “African Memory” of Mark (23).

In chapter 1, Oden describes the pre-Christian days of North African and the Diaspora Jews who migrated to Cyrene, Libya and Alexandria, Egypt beginning in the third century B.C. Then, he summarizes the African story of Mark beginning “with his birth in Cyrene (ca. A.D. 5-15), and from there tracks him to Jerusalem, to Rome, back to Cyrene in Africa and finally to his death in Egypt” (21). Part 1

---

comprises chapters 2-4 and concerns issues of definitions and methodology. Oden delineates the concept of “African Memory” and charts a composite sketch of the chronology of Mark (28-43). He identifies his primary sources including: New Testament texts, the patristic witness, synaxaries, Martyrium Marci, the Coptic writer Sawirus, and the current patriarch of the See of St. Mark, Senouda III. He readily admits that many of these sources are themselves based upon the authority and inspiration of Scripture (55-58). Part 2, chapters 5-7, traces the biblical portrait of Mark from the African perspective. Oden describes the close association between Barnabus and Mark and the tradition that the Last Supper and Pentecost occurred at the house of Mark’s mother (84-5, 92-4). He also considers the movements of Mark during the missionary journeys of Peter and Paul and his placement in Rome at the time of Peter’s death. Part 3 forms the heart of his argument: “Mark in Africa” (131). Oden observes a strong connection between Peter and Mark and the founding of the churches in Rome and Alexandria. After his missionary efforts with Peter, Mark seems to have returned to his people in Libya first before receiving a vision that encouraged him on to Egypt. Eventually, after extensive evangelistic efforts and other short journeys outside Egypt, Mark’s teaching raised enough concerns in Alexandria that he suffered martyrdom. In chapter 10, Oden describes the extent to which early Christian writers through Eusebius in 325 A.D. confirm the accounts of Mark’s death in Alexandria. In the final section, part 5, Oden brings all these pieces together and argues that the weight of evidence makes the “African Memory” of Mark at least “plausible” (221, 256). He also depicts his own academic and spiritual journey toward a greater appreciation for the African memory of Mark, and explains the importance of Mark in the grounding of early African liturgy and catechesis. Finally, Oden hopes that this book is not an end to itself, but the beginning of a larger project that uncovers “the wisdom of ancient Christian texts written on the continent of Africa and to communicate them to modern readers” (13). To facilitate this vision, he has assumed the role of director of the Center for Early African Christianity at Eastern University and readers can find out more about this project at www.earlyafricanchristianity.com.

Oden’s treatment of Mark is a good example of historiography that takes into account aspects of reception history typically ignored in modern treatments. Nevertheless, some of the categories are not without a measure of criticism. Although he uses the designation, “African Christianity” most of the evidence is derived from North Africa (45), although I anticipate that his larger project will address some of the evangelistic streams that pervade a larger extent of the continent. Furthermore, many NT scholars will likely remain skeptical of his sources that are not “historically verifiable fact” (254, c.f. 53-55, 59) and continue to assume that the Alexandrian church invented Mark’s martyrdom as a means to gain apostolic credibility among the larger church. Beside any issues of presuppositions, part of the issue is that the book is written for a more popular audience (14, c.f. 222). For biblical scholars a more academic treatment of these issues could be more convincing. In spite of these weaknesses, Oden has organized a fascinating collection of traditions on Mark. For any reader interested in the history of the evangelization of Africa or the life of the Mark the Evangelist, this book would be a valuable resource. Oden has made a good case for the African memory of Mark and helped a new generation of Christian ministers and scholars in the Global South to find their place in early Christianity.

Stephen O. Presley
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
In modern New Testament studies the apostle Peter has often taken a back seat to Paul. However, in recent decades there has been a revival in studying the historical Peter—the premier disciple of Christ. In 2010 Markus Bockmuehl published The Remembered Peter—an academic work of specialized studies that was the culmination of a decade of study (xiii). This present volume is a follow-up book that uses the research of the first volume but is less technical and in more of a narrative form. It is aimed at helping form a fresh perspective on Peter that is accessible to the graduate student or senior-level undergraduate and even teachers and pastors, and it is supposed to be a discussion starter rather than a compendium of final answers (xiv, 17).

Bockmuehl is a fellow of Keble College and professor of Biblical and Early Christian Studies at the University of Oxford. His expertise in early Christian studies is evident in this interesting book that examines the living memory about Peter through the first two centuries of the Christian church. Building on the work of Ulrich Luz and his emphasis on Wirkungsgeschichte (“history of effects”), Bockmuehl is interested in the streams of remembrances of Peter that passed from generation to generation (8). Thus, Bockmuehl believes “the experienced and remembered effects of a person’s words and actions are often as valuable a clue to their meaning as a knowledge of the original causes and circumstances” (11). His premise is that through the passing of time can come a mature perspective on persons and events that is difficult to obtain at the time they occurred. He notes, “Contemporary observers often turn out to be pretty poor witnesses to the history of their own times. What they perceive as successes may well turn out in retrospect to be little short of disastrous” (10). However, this assumption seems reasonable and warranted for all material except for the Bible, whose writers were guided by the Holy Spirit (2 Tim 3:16; 2 Pet 1:21).

After a brief examination of remembrances of Peter in the biblical canon, the book primarily focuses on the living memory of Peter in the East and then in the West. It is a thought-provoking and sometimes fruitful approach. Bockmuehl starts with a selective group of writings in the second century, and then he works his way chronologically backwards to and through the biblical texts. For instance, in examining living memory of Peter in the East, Bockmuehl examines writings of Serapion of Antioch, Justin Martyr, Ignatius of Antioch, Syrian noncanonical gospels, and the Pseudo-Clementine writings. For Eastern (in origin) biblical texts he examines John, Matthew, 2 Peter, and Galatians. Herein lies the weakness of this otherwise interesting book: the persistent doubts of the veracity of the biblical text. For instance, he believes that 1 Peter likely contains just some original writing from the apostle Peter, and that a disciple of Peter added to the material and composed 1 Peter (6, 30-31). At least he rejects that 1 Peter is totally pseudepigraphical (126-31). He agrees with many scholars today that nothing in 2 Peter was written by Peter himself (32, 89-90). Thus, 2 Peter may be a (possibly distorted) memory about Peter, but Peter did not write any of it. In the Gospels and Acts narratives he unfortunately

---

sometimes lessens the veracity of details as “redactional interests” (115), imaginative extrapolation (118), or “archaizing” tendencies (124). He also tends to date New Testament writings too late (e.g., AD 100 for 2 Peter). Dating them earlier would help fit them with the traditional author.

Although the emphasis is on the geography, chronology, and message of the living memories of Peter in textual evidence, Bockmuehl also extrapolates some data from an examination of Peter’s tomb at the Vatican (148-49), Peter’s house at Capernaum (37-39), and the two competing locations for the site of Bethsaida-Julias (169-74). One wishes he devoted more space to these stimulating studies.

So, what does Bockmuehl find? Here is some of what he sets as “tenuous” (181). Peter was not a foil of Paul but rather was a bridge builder between church factions (150). Peter’s ethnically-diverse upbringing in Bethsaida was conducive for him to be open to Jesus’ worldwide evangelistic mission (181). Jesus did call him to lead the church, but any line of personal succession after Peter is doubtful. Yet, “all bishops who confess the faith of Peter constitute the ‘rock’ … on which the church is founded (182)” — thus a type of succession is through all genuine pastors. Peter did die in Rome, as did Paul, and Peter’s tomb at the Vatican could be genuine (149).

Bockmuehl’s book is a helpful addition to modern Petrine studies, and it is a good reminder not to give Petrine studies short shrift. It is a testament to the importance of living memory and an example of the importance of Patristic studies today. The book is a thought-provoking study, and it can motivate the reader to do further research in this area. The related website that organizes, categorizes, and translates primary source materials can be helpful in this regard (http://simonpeter.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/). However, a stronger belief in the accuracy of the New Testament writings could lead Bockmuehl to firmer, more elaborate, and less tenuous conclusions about Peter.

James R. Wicker
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary


Robert Kolb’s latest contribution to Luther scholarship in *Luther and the Stories of God* presents an impressive account of Martin Luther’s use of biblical narrative to inform daily Christian living. Kolb introduces his study describing how Luther’s view of the Bible’s depiction of man’s relation to the Creator God caused his worldview to take narrative shape. What Kolb means by “narrative” is that Luther saw in Scripture “God’s unfolding plan for his human creatures” (ix). This “unfolding plan” constitutes the Christian’s “metanarrative,” that is, “a master narrative that makes sense of incorporated specific stories” (ix). The Bible provides this grand narrative while it also communicates the individual stories of the history of God’s work in Christ as well as the history of God’s people (ix).

In the next two chapters, Kolb further explores the Reformer’s notion of “metanarrative” and presents a sketch of Luther as a gifted storyteller. In chapter 1, “The Whole Life of a Christian as a Life of Repentance: Luther’s Metanarrative,” Kolb covers a vast amount of terrain in Luther’s theology from his view of history to what Kolb sees as the three essential distinctions in Luther’s hermeneutics for proclaiming the core of the biblical message (i.e. law and Gospel, the two kinds of
righteousness, and the two realms). Repentance is the ongoing struggle to resist the temptations of the flesh, the lures of the world, and the lies of the evil one. Luther regarded the biblical narratives as aids in the Christian fight of faith through which contemporary Christians could wage war against sin, and likewise, encounter the love and mercy of their Creator God in Christ (27). In chapter 2, “Luther the Storyteller: The Reformer’s Use of Narrative,” Kolb focuses on Luther’s rhetorical ability to retell the stories of the Bible in a vivid and fresh way for the everyday Christian. Luther desired his hearers to read the Bible with him; together they entered into the world of the biblical text where the sacred page would come alive, “creating a conversation between ancients and contemporaries” (51).

Kolb returns in the final four chapters to the question of the place of “story” in Luther’s understanding of “the practical life of faith and action” (65). Chapter 3 on “Above All, Fearing, Loving, and Trusting in God: Defining the Core of What it Means to Be Human,” explains Luther’s belief that faith in God restores a person to true humanity because of the implications of the First Commandment (72). Rather than teach this truth in the abstract, Luther replayed the stories of the Bible, often with creative license, to provide concrete personifications of fear, faith, and loving action for his sixteenth-century listeners (97). In chapter 4, “Suffering Builds Faith and Calls to Repentance: Affliction as Part of Daily Life,” Kolb recalls Luther’s employment of the biblical narratives to serve as warnings and examples for contemporary believers for struggling with sin, remaining steadfast in faith, and as a reminder to Christians that God would never forsake his people despite their failings or their hardships (122).

Next, Kolb addresses Luther’s concern for a Christian’s devotion to God in chapter 5 on “The Life of Faith in Responding to God’s Word with Prayer and Praise: Active Obedience in the Sacred Realm.” Paradigmatic narratives such as the two disciples with Jesus on the road to Emmaus in Luke 24 or Anna the widow in Luke 2 were authoritative accounts of how believers should respond with a burning heart of faith and a soul bursting with praise after an encounter with the Word of God (129–32). Kolb, then, builds upon chapter 5 by expounding upon the way biblical narratives guided Christians concerning “The Life of Faith in Serving the Neighbor: Luther’s Ethic of Callings and Commands” in chapter 6. Luther utilized many of the stories in Genesis and the Gospels to function as models or patterns for how people ought to treat one another (168). And in his final chapter on “Living Well Leads to Dying Well: The Completion of the Christian Life,” Kolb inspects the role of biblical narratives in Luther’s teaching on the “art of dying” (169). Here the Bible’s record of the death of the saints provided Luther the opportunity to encourage his hearers in life’s most haunting moment to have a confident hope in Christ’s death, resurrection, and the promise of life everlasting (179).

Kolb’s *Luther and the Stories of God* is a timely publication since the concept of “narrative” remains a popular interest in the various disciplines of Christian theology. Perhaps one of the most fruitful aspects of this book is where Kolb sets Luther’s “metanarrative” into conversation with its modern proponents such as George Lindbeck, Hans Frei, and Kevin Vanhoozer. Ultimately, Kolb finds Luther’s view of “narrative” most akin to Vanhoozer’s canonical-linguistic model insofar as the biblical stories (i.e. the biblical texts) are “directive” for living before God and in relation to one’s neighbor (40).

Another positive byproduct of Kolb’s study is where he expresses Luther’s idea of “history.” Instead of treating “narrative” primarily as a communal or cultural
category, Luther rooted his view of “story” within the time-bounds of history from which he saw God interacting with creation and humanity throughout Scripture. Without biblical history, there was no “story” for Luther. Scripture unfolded the great eschatological battle between God and Satan, between faith and unbelief, and this “story” was what Luther believed was to be replayed in the lives of his students and sermon listeners (9). At one point, Kolb reflects that neither Luther nor Calvin developed “story” as its own theological category, and it seems that this may be due to the fact that, at least for Luther, his idea of “history” alone was sufficient to carry the theological weight (26).

A few points of critique should be mentioned at this juncture. First, Luther and the Stories of God appears to contain some organizational missteps. Chapter 2 on “Luther the Storyteller: The Reformer’s Use of Narrative” interrupts the flow of Kolb’s presentation by returning to many of the same topics he addressed in his “Introduction: Luther Storyteller and His Cultivation of the Christian Life.” Kolb initiates the main thrust of his study in chapter 1 insofar as he summarizes Luther’s “metanarrative” as repentance, and then, sets forth the outline of Luther’s major emphases for Christian living that become the central subjects for chapters 3 through 7. Why he breaks this flow with an extended analysis of Luther’s storytelling, preaching, and how the Reformer compares to contemporary scholarship on narrative theology, is unclear. It seems that structurally, the study is more effective if all matters concerning Luther’s concept of “narrative” and his performance as a biblical “narrator” are established prior to unpacking Luther’s key points for how “the stories of God” speak to the Christian life.

Repeated themes and topics also abound in Kolb’s book. For instance, the introduction covers in relative detail his view of “narrative,” the Bible, history, worldview, oral and printed communication, and his role as a “storyteller” of Scripture. These same themes reappear in chapter 2 often only extending the discussion, but not without returning to the same points featured in the introduction. Similarly, Kolb titles chapter 1 as “The Whole of the Christian Life as a Life of Repentance,” but in chapter 4, “Suffering Builds Faith and Calls to Repentance,” he revisits already covered themes such as the mortification of sin and life as the battleground for the conflict between God and evil. Although these later chapters move the subjects into deeper discussion, the fact that their initial treatments were more than superficial creates at times a redundant and cluttered experience for the reader.

In sum, Kolb has offered an integrated study which embodies a truly multifaceted Luther as it unveils aspects of the Reformer that do not always enjoy the most attention in the broader evangelical community such as his pastoral theology, his role as a preacher, and his passion for not only faith in the Christian life, but also for holiness through daily repentance. Luther and the Stories of God is a thorough, yet practical book by a seasoned scholar which pictures Luther as ever the pastor-preacher regardless of whether the lectern or the pulpit upholds his copy of the Scriptures.

Billy Marsh
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

After Jonathan Edwards is a tour de force on matters concerning Edwardsian influence. As a treatment of Edwardsian legacy, the contributors explore the influence of Edwards’s thought in the context of New England Theology. In one sense, this book is about the followers of Edwards like Bellamy, Hopkins, Emmons, and Amasa Parks, but really this is about Edwards. As a complex, controversial, and admired figure in the American context and the Reformed tradition, Edwards displays a magnificent influence in academic theology, the tradition of reformation thought, natural theology, and Christian culture building. At least this is seen in the pages of After Jonathan Edwards. In this way, to say that the book is a contribution to the literature on Edwards would be an understatement; thus theologians and historians would be wise to consider it.

The book structure is in three parts. First, the authors consider the general influence of Edwards’s thought in America. Valeri demonstrates the fact that Edwards and New England Calvinism is comprehensive and robust in terms of the culture of the day instead of old Calvinism that had little to say to contemporary culture. Minkema demonstrates the influence Edwardsian education had on American higher education. Guelso and Byrd shows the novel influence Edwardsian views of agency have on the debates concerning original sin, a theme that comes up throughout the book. Finally, Crisp and Helm discuss Edward’s influence on two central theological matters—one on the moral government theory of the atonement prominent in New England thought, and the other on human freedom as compared with older Calvinism. The second section carries the discussion forward in the context of discussing Edwards’s successors (e.g. Hopkins, Emmons, Griffin, Taylor, Park). Readers will find surprising and unusual theological moves in Edwards’ successors, which are sometimes heterodox but many times remain consistent with orthodoxy albeit with a unique spin. Even still these men are brilliant in their theological construction and dissemination. In the third section, the authors explore Edwards’s influence on various Christian denominations and parts of the world beyond America (e.g. Congregationalists, Presbyterianism, Baptists, European Christian culture, and Asian culture). The authors persuasively show that Edwards has had an astonishing influence on both the West and the East, something that was unclear prior to the research displayed in the pages of After Jonathan Edwards.

No doubt there is much to gain from reading this work; however, given a review of this length one must do a bit of cherry-picking. I mention three gems here. The first gem to take note of is the academic influence Edwards’s thought had on both the general academic culture as well on his own reformed tradition. The second gem to take note of is the influence Edwards has on contemporary Baptist and evangelical culture today. Finally, the third gem to take note of is one of unfamiliar territory, namely, Edwardsian reception in Europe and Asia.

First, Edwards’s thought has influenced both academic culture and the reformed tradition in notable ways. Edwardsian thought on the nature of the will and agency receive much deserved attention having crucial implications for doctrinal coherence. The authors show that the distinction made between “natural” ability and “moral” ability were novel contributions to the theological landscape. While many reformers were pessimistic about man’s powers of rationality Edwards was not. Hav-
ing drawn heavily from Enlightenment philosophy in constructing arguments for
God and human psychology he was instead optimistic (chapter 3). However, his
view of the will was still consistently reformed in important ways (see especially
Helm’s contrast of Calvin and Edwards in chapter 6). By denying faculty psychol-
ogy, Edwards could distinguish between man’s ability to choose the good, but his
inability in terms of desire (i.e. moral inability). This distinction proved important in
constructive developments concerning original sin where man’s will was in line with
the first Adam or the second Adam. Additionally, this distinction proved invaluable
in opening the door for a variety of atonement theories that are, arguably, in line
with Edwardsian Calvinism yet with important distinctions (see Crisp in chapter 5).

The second gem concerning Edwardsian influence on Baptist and evangelical
culture is now undeniable and persists to this day. As to baptistic thought, Haykin
argues for Edwardsian influence as early as the 1700s amongst English Baptists. This
is especially true of the Baptist divine Andrew Fuller, a major influence on Particu-
lar Baptists (198). In fact, Haykin notes the Baptist Francis Wayland (1796-1865)
saying, “Fuller’s brand of Edwardsianism had become ‘almost universal’ among the
Baptists in the ‘northern and eastern States’” (206). Also worth noting is Edwards’s
influence on moderate calvinistic Baptists who were largely committed to the gov-
ernmental theory of the atonement, something Edwards himself did not support,
but something for which he laid the foundations (204). This influence extends to
many baptistic circles today, prominently seen in certain circles of the Baptist cul-
ture emphasizing the doctrines of grace, a Calvinism of affections, and the glory of
God (e.g. Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, John Piper, Haykin and Thomas
Nettles). It is in fact true to say that while many calvinistic Baptists were influenced
by common sense realism (e.g. Princetonians, Jaces P. Boyce), it would not be true to
say that Edwards too did not have a large role to play in Baptist culture.

The third gem is the awe-inspiring effects Edwards has had and continues to
have in scholarly and religious reception. Possibly, one of the most important chap-
ters in the book is the chapter by Michael J. McClymond, which the editors refer
 to as “the most original essay” (255). In it McClymond breaks new ground where
he reveals hidden links between the great American thinker and the continent of
Europe, specifically, British, French, and German thought. Perhaps even more scant
in research is the impact Edwards had on Asian thought, an area of research hardly
even in the minds of academics until now. Anri Morimoto, in chapter 16, opens a
door for further scholarship once unknown. Both are gems worthy of consideration.

Unmistakably, Edwards was a philosopher-theologian-pastor-evangelist-re-
vivalist with a mind that has no match. Whilst the culture of New England thought
did not persist, New England thought continues to emerge in a variety of religious
and academic contexts. Edwards and his successors are of considerable importance
to Baptists and evangelicals in the area of theology and culture. We must listen care-
fully. If nothing else, After Jonathan Edwards confirms this to us.

Joshua Farris
The University of Bristol
The traditional problem of free will (though by no means the only problem of free will) focuses on whether or not human freedom—however this is defined—is consistent with determinism, the thesis that from the present only one particular future can possibly unfold, which entails that the future is closed. But, could it be that this traditional problem is not one involving human freedom and determinism, but one that asks us to consider whether or not the concept of an entity (human or non-human) performing an action—i.e., agency—is consistent with determinism? This is what Helen Steward in *A Metaphysics for Freedom* contends is the fundamental issue in the traditional problem of free will.

Steward argues for a version of libertarianism that she calls “Agency Incompatibilism,” which is the thesis that the existence of agency in the world indicates that the future is open, that more than one possible future can unfold from the present. Steward outlines her position in chapter 1. Agency, Steward claims, refers not to the loftier and more sophisticated abilities that most philosophers reference in free-will literature, but rather to animal agency, the ability to move one’s body in such a way that one can carry out plans of one’s own devising—i.e., plans that are the product of self-moving or that are “up to” us (2-9). It is this humble ability that humans and animals of certain complexity possess that seems to indicate that the future is open and that freedom and determinism are incompatible. In chapter 2, Steward defends this claim against compatibilists who argue that the idea of something being “up to” us is not inconsistent with determinism. Here, she introduces her key concept of “settling.” “settling” expresses the idea of an action bringing about or causing something to be that was not established before, an action that closes off other possibilities that until that time remained open until that action occurred (39-42). Steward points out that if determinism is true, then agents cannot be the causes of their actions because those actions have already been settled at a time prior to the agents’ existence, which means that agents’ actions cannot be “up to” them. Consequently, if determinism is true, then agents are not free at all, either in a compatibilist or libertarian sense.

Chapters 3 through 5 flesh out Steward’s account of Agency Incompatibilism. Chapter 3 focuses on objections to Steward’s concept of “settling” that she argues are ultimately unsatisfactory. Chapter 4 gives a fuller definition of the concept of agency. Agents are entities that (i) can move their bodies, (ii) are centers of subjectivity, (iii) have intentional states, and (iv) are settlers of matters concerning the movement of their bodies (71-72). In the same chapter, Steward argues based on developmental psychology and evolutionary continuity that agency should be ascribed to certain animals. Chapter 5 addresses the epistemological objection, which states that because the question of determinism is a question that only physics can answer and because physics may one day prove that determinism is true, one cannot claim to know that there are agents in the world as Steward has described them. Steward argues that this objection ultimately begs the question.

In the last three chapters, Steward addresses two problems that every libertarian position encounters—the problem of chance—and whether the proposed libertarian position actually exists given what we know about the world. Chapters 6 and 7 deal with the former problem; chapter 8 deals with the latter. Chapter 8
is particularly important since Steward’s libertarian position is a modification of agent-causation. After answering objections against agent-causation in general, she attempts to explain how her agency theory could possibly be instantiated in a naturalistic world, defending a top-down view of causation in which the causal power of the organism over its respective parts is not reducible to the sum of the causation governing its parts.

Steward’s book is both unique and intriguing, which incidentally accounts for its strengths. She notes that her inquiry deviates from the traditional lines of discussion that are familiar in the philosophical literature on free will, and by doing so, she has identified not only the fundamental issue that motivates libertarianism in general—the idea that an agent plays a unique and irreducible role in the actions that he or she performs—but also has corrected an oversight of many libertarians. Both libertarians and compatibilists insist that free agents’ actions are “up to” them, which means that at the very least agents contribute to the production of those actions. However, it is not possible for actions to be “up to” an agent if determinism is true because, as Steward points out, causes outside of the agent have already “settled” the action without the agent’s involvement. In this case, the agent is merely a passive conduit through which the action will take place, not a contributor to the action. As Steward points out, this entails two conclusions. First, compatibilists cannot speak of agents whose actions are “up to” them, for determinism rules out the existence of agents and, thus, actions altogether. Second, libertarians should not speak of agents performing actions that are not “up to” them, for there are no such things as actions that are not “up to” agents. Libertarians need not concede to compatibilists that there are such things as “our actions” that are not “up to” us—a concession that seems to have gone unchallenged until now and has placed libertarian positions in the rather difficult quandary of explaining how agents cause (either in a noncausal, event-causal, or agent-causal fashion) those actions of theirs that are determined. Obviously, the strength of Steward’s position hinges her concept of “settling”; but, as far as I can see, the concept seems to describe accurately what we mean when we say that agents are entities that perform actions. Steward seems to present a very plausible argument for why the existence of agents reveals ipso facto that determinism is false.

Steward’s defense in chapter 4 that certain non-human animals also have free will (in her sense of animal agency) is significant for free-will discussions. Animals exemplify a sort of “randomness” about their actions that seems to defy any law-like description available to us at this time. Steward gives us a way to account for this “randomness” and at the same time explains why we have a propensity to treat more complex animals as if they are persons with goals and desires. Although I think that evolutionary continuity (73) is an unwarranted (or at best weak) assumption upon which to base an argument for certain complex animals having free will, Steward’s argument for animals as agents moving their bodies in ways to carry out certain devised plans rather than as instinctual machines operating by physical laws deserves serious consideration nonetheless.

The major weakness of Steward’s work lies in the last chapter. In explaining how agency can be said to exist in our world, Steward argues for a number of important conclusions that show how free will as agency makes sense given what we know about the world. Of importance is her explanation of how the concept of substance causation (of which agency [or agent-causation] is a species) need not be considered metaphysically mysterious since the assumption that all causation is event-based
is unwarranted and appeals on spurious reasoning (207-12). However, in trying to
defend a naturalistic view of agency, Steward faces the unique problem of explaining
how free will and the choices arising from it do not derive or emerge from lower-
level physical properties belonging to the individual parts of an organism that are
governed by laws (e.g., physical, biological, chemical) over which the organism has
not control. Steward argues that organisms include not just the collection of their
lower-level constituents, but also the complex synchronous arrangements of those
collections that factor into the organism’s causal story (238-43). What accounts for
these arrangements is the phenomenon of “coincidence,” which Steward notes intro-
duces the concept of design (237). But, because Steward restricts her view of agency
to a naturalistic metaphysic, ultimately it is natural selection that accounts for this
design (237, n. 64; 245-46). Even if we grant for a moment that natural selection is
an accurate substitute for design, it seems that this does not give Steward the control
that associates with agency. Natural selection is subject to the same laws govern-
ing the rest of the world, laws that also govern the lower-level physical properties
from which higher-level properties are supposed to emerge. Just because nature has
found that a more complex synchronously arranged system is required to meet the
needs of complex mobile creatures, as Steward says (246), does not entail that this
more complex system is anything other than a system whose operation ultimately
derives from the same laws that govern lower-level physical properties over which
an organism has no control. Steward is correct to see that agent-causal theories need
design; but, if what she means by design is the manifestations of natural selection,
it does not seem that she can overcome the problem of free will being an emergent
property whose operations are reducible to the operations of laws over which one
has no control.

One should not be deterred by this weakness in Steward’s agent-causal theory.
Although she does fail to show how free will can exist in a naturalistic context, the
rest of Steward’s work represents an important contribution to the literature on free
will. She provides not only a much simpler way of showing how free will and deter-
minism are incompatible, which entails (as she points out) that all of the other kinds
of freedoms that we value so highly are also incompatible with determinism, but also
an assessment of agency that broadens our understanding of free will beyond the
human world and can perhaps resolve some of the persisting problems in free-will
literature. Readers will also appreciate how Steward challenges common assump-
tions underlying many of the free-will debates—e.g., assumptions dealing with the
role of physics in establishing the truth of determinism, the problem of chance fac-
ing libertarianism, and the nature of causation. Philosophers who are theists may
also find Steward’s appeal to design helpful in constructing their own libertarian
views. This reviewer certainly considers it such since he believes it reveals that the
metaphysics of freedom ultimately requires a designer, not nature, to account for free
will in the world.

Stephen D. Mizell
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

Work and economic matters pervade the life of every person on this planet. Lately, Christian theology has turned its eyes to exploring the theological underpinnings of work and economics. In How God Makes the World A Better Place, David Wright presents a Wesleyan primer on understanding God’s purposes in work and economics. Wright states that the purpose of this primer is to make the work of individuals a source of lifelong happiness and well-being (xii). Work is what people spend most of their time doing. It is the source of people’s resources for living as well as for blessing others. It also has a profound effect on one’s self-esteem. Work and economics, therefore, are quite important for a person’s physical and even spiritual life. It is a way that God, along with the individual, makes the world a better place to live through spiritual well-being, just social systems, and loving engagement with others. Work permeates our being, identity, and purpose; therefore, it is not a subject of which to be dismissive or stigmatize (6-7). In fact, Wright sees work and economics as part of our sanctification and discipleship. We are to be so captivated with Christ and his holiness that we are led to follow and be like him even in our work (13-15).

The two primary questions that shape this primer’s discussion of faith, work, and economics is who God has called us to be and what has he called us to do. Part 1 deals with the first question. Wright’s answer to this first question is that God has called us to salvation through Christ to be people who are holy and filled with love for God and neighbor. This calling gives us the assurance and confidence to work with purpose and conviction despite whatever hardships are faced. This calling also makes us people of integrity so that we may redeem work from the moral morass and mistrust that hampers our economic efforts. Lastly, this calling makes us authentic human beings for we are being the kinds of people that God created us to be rather than some false imitation. In short, God has called us to express the very image of God that he has given us (23, 44).

Part 2 deals with the question of what God has called us to do. Simply put, Wright argues that God has called us to do good works which is inextricably linked to the process of sanctification (51). As a result of an internal change, we are able to do good works and bless others. Our work, therefore, leads us to promote three main things in the lives of others. First, we are to promote personal well-being. This includes not only physical but also spiritual well-being. It also involves showing fairness and compassion to those both within and without our place of employment as well as bringing peace to a workplace marred by the effects of sin. All of this is to bring glory to God and recapture the splendor of his creation. A second thing we should promote in our work is social and economic well-being. Christian workers must be involved in making the community a better place through both social and even political action. We must always look to help those who are less fortunate find personal well-being. Lastly, Christian workers are to promote Christian compassion through their work. Work is defined not by what one does but by how he does it. We work to get what we can so that we may save it and then use it to help others. By following these biblically based principles, Wright contends that we will make the world a better place, the place that God wants it to be.

What is refreshing about the Wesleyan position on faith, work, and economics is its emphasis on the connection between work and the human essence. Too often
people view work as drudgery or a curse to their lives which is entirely the opposite of what God intended. Work is an integral part of who we are as human beings. God himself is a worker, so it is no coincidence that we reflect that aspect of the divine nature in our imagio Dei. Focusing our attention on work as part of the image of God within us as well as something in need of redemption and sanctification is of great importance to our idea of work as well as our commitment to follow and obey God.

Where the Wesleyan position detracts is in its overemphasis on beneficence and altruism. While these things are definitely a part of work and economics that cannot be dismissed, they are not all encompassing of economics. Individual needs and desires also play a part in economics, but the Wesleyan position as portrayed by Wright ignores, if not dismisses, this aspect of work and economics. The Wesleyan position does not seem aware that personal self-interest can drive altruistic behavior for we cannot necessarily get what we need and desire without being concerned about the needs and desires of others first. This appears to be how all work operates. As a result, the Wesleyan position suffers from an imbalanced view of faith, work, and economics.

Graham Floyd
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary


Same-sex marriage, gay rights, and alternative sexual lifestyles seem to dominate the public consciousness today. From professional sports players coming out as gay to judges overturning marriage laws to allow same-sex marriage, the conversation regarding homosexuality is constantly around us. In most of these instances, the conversation pits Christianity against a secular worldview hoping to affirm homosexual identity. However, a highly anticipated book recently changed the focus of the conversation from “Christians against the world” to an in-house discussion among self-proclaimed evangelicals. In _God and the Gay Christian_, Matthew Vines attempts to reform the historic teaching of Christianity on the issue of homosexuality and same-sex marriage.

Vines proposes that “Christians who affirm the full authority of Scripture can also affirm committed, monogamous same-sex relationships” (3). In order to support his thesis, the author sets out to debunk the traditional interpretation of the six main biblical passages that have been used to condemn homosexuality. In addition, he seeks to show that celibacy for the person struggling with homosexual desires is a damaging state that undermines their expression of the image of God. Finally, he desires to show that committed, monogamous same-sex relationships are on par with traditional heterosexual marriage and should be supported by the church.

In order to make his argument, Vines works from a few key assumptions. First, he assumes that suffering is inherently evil. In his opening chapter, Vines draws on Jesus’ parable in Matthew 7:15–20 regarding a tree and its fruit. He compares any pain or suffering brought to homosexuals through the condemnation of their sexual activities to be bad fruit brought forth by a bad tree. By contrast, he considers the affirmation of homosexual activity to be good fruit produced by a good tree.

Vines’ second assumption is that Scripture and its authors know nothing of sexual orientation. As a result, none of the traditional interpretations of Genesis 19, Leviticus 18:22 and 20:13, Romans 1:26–27, 1 Corinthians 6:9, and 1 Timothy 1:10...
are valid for contemporary discussions of sexuality. He believes that modern understandings of sexuality as immutable and unchosen dismiss any interpretation that condemns homosexual behavior for any reason other than gross excess.

The author also assumes that biological difference and role complementarity have nothing to do with marriage and sexuality. Vines believes that Scripture does not speak of biological difference as valid for sexual expression. He also holds that any discussion of role complementarity is grounded in a cultural hierarchy that understands women to be less than fully valuable. As a result, he builds a vision of sexual expression and marriage on commitment and covenant-keeping.

Using these assumptions, Vines builds his case that Christian teachings need to be modified in order to support same-sex relationships. In modifying these teachings, Vines embarks on a dangerous hermeneutical path that leaves some questions unanswered and creates some problems that he does not foresee.

First, Vines elevates his personal experience above Scripture as a source of authority. This is not a critique of which he is unaware. In fact, he says he was confronted by a church member early on with this exact critique (13). Even though he claims not to do so, he in fact affirms this very thing. He states, “I had a second reason for losing confidence in the belief that same-sex relationships are sinful: it no longer made sense to me” (12). His own experience of trying to affirm his lifestyle with the text of Scripture led him on a journey to reinterpret the Bible in light of his own experience. We see this throughout the book from his basic desire to have same-sex relationships no longer be called a sin to his condemnation of expecting celibacy from Christians who struggle with same-sex desires. His personal experience and desires do not fit that biblical expectation, so he believes it must be wrong.

Second, Vines fails to defend his position that committed, monogamous same-sex relationships are equal to marriage. The biggest failure in his argument is that he does not explain why such relationships have to be monogamous. He dismisses the idea of the potentiality for procreation as a key aspect of marriage (137–41); thus, he can no longer claim any natural extension of parenting as a reason to limit marriage to only two people. He considers the key element of marriage to be covenant-keeping, yet he fails to provide an argument why this would limit marriage to two people. As a result, he assumes marriage is monogamous but provides no real reason for such a limitation. His choice of monogamy is arbitrary in light of his definition of marriage.

Finally, Vines neglects to realize that his claims regarding homosexuality open the door for misunderstanding the Christ-church relationship. While discussing the text of Ephesians 5 and its implications for marriage, Vines argues that the authority and submission structure in the text is built on ancient patriarchy. He notes the connection to slaves and masters in Ephesians 6 as evidence that we can no longer justify role complementarity since we do not affirm the institution of salvery. However, there are two serious failings of his argumentation. First, he ignores the fact that parents and children are also mentioned in Ephesians 6. The authority of parents over children, and the subsequent submission of children to parents, would also have to be overturned by Vines’ argumentation; however, he does not even mention those verses. In addition, Vines’ argumentation requires elevating the church to be equal with Christ. In doing so, one steps into the realm of heresy since Scripture states that the church is in submission to Christ. Vines’ cultural hermeneutic fails to protect against this logical conclusion to his own argument.

While this book has been highly touted by a number of pastors and theolo-
gians, the arguments fall short of making a biblical case. Instead, Vines sets out to make Scripture align with his own desires rather than conforming himself to the truth of Scripture (Romans 12:2).

Evan Lenow
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

Studies in Preaching and Pastoral Ministry


The size of the church, the scope of ministry, and the influence of Tim Keller and his church in Manhattan would cause many to flock to *Center Church* as a tell-all manual for successful church planting, but this book hardly resembles a step-by-step curriculum. Reading the first few pages of this book readily gives the impression that at the heart of any Gospel ministry lies a Gospel message that needs deep thoughtful consideration and it must pervade through the life of the church.

The book is divided into three parts: Gospel, City, and Movement. The first section on the Gospel draws the reader to the basic question of what is the Gospel and what are its effects. This part is the gem of the book, acting as the basic foundation to the rest of the book. Keller reminds his readers how the Gospel has been misconstrued with people who commonly confuse it for what he calls, “competing sets of beliefs and worldviews” (58). In this section, Keller draws contrasts between religion and Gospel. For example, religion says “I obey; therefore, I’m accepted,” while the Gospel says, “I’m accepted, therefore I obey” (65). Another compelling contrast is in the way religion dictates identity and self-worth based on appearances, deeds, and morality, while the Gospel finds its identity in Christ alone. Self-centeredness amounts to religion, but an honest view of oneself and the work of Christ leads to the Gospel of God’s grace.

The second section deals with the city. The content of this section ranges from issues dealing with contextualization of the Gospel to the challenges of reaching the outside world, which Keller defines as the city in reference to the urban setting where he ministers. The call to contextualization is not compromising the message but, as Keller puts it, “to immerse yourself in the questions, hopes, and beliefs of the culture so you can give a biblical, Gospel-centered response to its questions” (121). Reaching the city is more than taking the Gospel message to the outside world; it is a calling to serve the city by seeking its good and becoming a “dynamic” counterculture that ministers to the city.

The third section discusses movement in the context of missions, the ministry within the church, and the planting of new churches. When understanding movement, Keller points to God being active through the missional church—i.e., evangelistic, incarnational, contextual, reciprocal and communal. This missional church is called to confront society’s idols but at the same time, the church as a whole ought to reach people by serving and engaging. Keller also stresses the vital importance of church planting, not as a trendy catch-phrase, but as part of a natural outworking of church life that forms a movement, dynamic in nature rather than an institutionalized one.

Having observed these contributions of the books, some drawbacks may become apparent with this work. First, the “city,” which Keller uses to focus on the
ministry of the church, may seem out of reach for many pastors not in an urban context. Second, the occasional Presbyterian viewpoints, especially in light of limited detailing of church history, may seem difficult to relate in some ecclesial settings. Third, Keller’s use of secular sociological models and approaches may be unfit for understanding the sacred life of the church as a whole. There are others, but these three may suffice to reduce the book’s appeal for some ministers.

However, the aim of Keller’s *Center Church* is not to produce cookie-cutter churches that resemble Keller’s own Redeemer Presbyterian Church. The church planting efforts of his church prove this to be the case; their church-planting school plants churches of different denominations as long as these churches hold to the sound doctrine of the Gospel truth. What Keller offers here in each of these chapters is an opportunity to engage in the Gospel ministry in more thoughtful ways, from the very foundation of doctrine to the internal life of the church along with its outreach to the world beyond itself. The models, history, and concepts are not limited to New York City. Rather, they almost always describe the human condition in terms general enough to affect preaching and service. Ministers and those in training would benefit from the content of each chapter as well as the reflective questions that follow. Keller has given plenty to think about in this volume to challenge church leaders both young and old while they seek to carry on the Gospel ministry.

Donald Kim
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary


John Piper’s book, *Brothers, We Are Not Professionals*, is an exhortation to pastors, calling them to minister with a heart in tune to God, rather than with a reliance upon “an education, a set of skills, and a set of guild-defined standards which are possible without faith in Jesus” (x). Looking back on his own ministry, Piper remarks that his regrets lie not in the arena of professionalism, but rather in passion and prayer.

The original edition of the book was published in 2002 during the height of the evangelical church’s fascination with corporate leadership methods and structures. Pastors and church leaders sought to incorporate the latest pragmatic solution into the life of the church. Decisions were based upon asking, “What works?” rather than, “What is God calling us to do?” Piper’s voice cut through the madness and called pastors back to caring for souls. He writes in the Preface of the new edition that, “nothing has happened in the last ten years to make me think this book is less needed” (ix). Though the drift of professionalism in churches today is present, it is subtly different. It may not resemble the three-piece suit of the CEO’s office, yet it remains while speaking more in terms of “communication or contextualization” (ix).

In order to combat this encroaching pressure to meet an ambiguous standard, Piper lays out thirty-six exhortations for pastors. These reminders all beckon ministers to remember and focus on the spiritual task of shepherding the flock entrusted to them. The new edition contains six new chapters clarifying some theological issues that Piper felt needed to be addressed, and some practical insights that he gained over the last ten years. Piper’s voice was sorely needed in 2002, and the need remains to this day for this wise instruction from a seasoned pastor who has remained steady despite the pressures, fads, and trends that can so quickly derail ministers from their
primary task.

The book is built on these thirty-six exhortations, each meriting its own chapter, calling the pastor back to his primary task. These exhortations can be categorized in terms of theological exhortations, practical insights, spiritual reminders, and deeply personal emphases that Piper embraced and exampled during his faithful ministry.

As one who has read Piper before might expect, he pounds the drum of God’s sovereign joy and supremacy as the heartbeat of ministry, writing, “Everything in our salvation is designed by God to magnify the glory of God” (13). Piper spends the first several chapters on these theological exhortations detailing for the reader the message that has been given to pastors to proclaim. He touches on subjects such as justification by faith, Christian hedonism, and the love of God.

Other chapters may be categorized as practical insights shared by a seasoned pastor. He charges pastors to preach sermons saturated with the text of Scripture, rather than striving to entertain their hearers in order to gain an audience. He reminds pastors of the vast importance of studying the original languages of Scripture, stewarding their health, and reading Christian biographies for their own edification and joy.

He further provides encouragement for pastors to remain faithful by calling them to be men of prayer, and reminding them that the ministry of the Word is the centerpiece of faithful ministry. Throughout ministry, pastors will experience the natural drift of this world away from such spiritual practices, for they rarely appear on spreadsheets and data.

The last several chapters of the book hinge upon the emphases that have characterized Piper’s ministry over these last ten years. He calls pastors to emphasize the importance of global missions, to seek racial reconciliation, to defend passionately the unborn, and to love their wives as Christ loves the church. These are emphases that, over time, came to the forefront of Piper’s ministry. Young pastors would be wise to consider these issues as repeated applications of the Gospel.

One finds great difficulty critiquing a book written in the form of Piper’s *Brothers, We Are Not Professionals*. Most readers will find in John Piper a pastor with more insight, experience, and wisdom than they. However, there are a few points within the book that demand clarification.

One example of such needed clarification is that Piper’s passing references to major thrusts written in greater detail in his own voluminous writings demand further reading on the part of the reader. One simply cannot understand the concept of Christian hedonism apart from *Desiring God*. One may remain unconvinced that God is the Gospel, unless they read Piper’s book, *God is the Gospel*. Many will find that his chapters on topics on which he has written on before will be incomplete and brief.

The emphases that Piper provides for his readers grow out of his own personal theological convictions concerning the sovereignty of God in salvation and the doctrines of grace. However generous he may strive to be in his writings, these emphases always come to the forefront in his writings. Those who agree with him on these points (or even most of them) may not even take notice of the foundation. However, those who differ with his soteriological foundation may find greater disunity at the point of application.

One other potential critique lies in Piper’s chapter on the issue of baptism. As a Baptist, this reviewer resonates with his argument for believer’s baptism and the
importance therein. However, in taking up the argument, Piper has opened himself
to criticism from both sides. Those who maintain a paedobaptist distinctive may take
offense that Piper has raised the issue, and presented a defense of believer’s baptism
over against infant baptism in a book that would otherwise appeal across denomina-
tional lines. Others who hold to credobaptist convictions may react negatively to
Piper’s emphasis that this is not a primary doctrine, and something that should not
“cut us off from shared worship and ministry with others who share more important
things with us” (161). Historically, one can easily see that these different understand-
ings of baptism have always separated believers, often with violence.

John Piper’s, *Brothers, We Are Not Professionals* is the needed reminder to aban-
don the notion that faithful ministry is predicated upon some professional veneer
and to embrace the deeply spiritual reality that they are called to something else
altogether. For, he writes, “there is an infinite difference between the pastor whose
heart is set on being a professional and the pastor whose heart is set on being the
aroma of Christ, the fragrance of death to some and eternal life to others (2 Cor.
2:15–16)” (3).

David G. Norman, Jr.
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

*Called to Lead: Paul’s Letters to Timothy for a New Day*. By Anthony B. Robin-
$18.97.

Robinson and Wall have attempted to write a commentary on the practical
theology of two of the Pastoral Epistles. The foreward suggests that the target audi-
ence is “‘main-line, progressive’ churches” (ix). The intent is to bring application to
the contemporary church from books that are purported rarely to be read. To be fair,
the preface to this book clearly describes one of the authors as “Wesleyan” and the
other as “liberal” (xii); labels that they consistently reflect throughout the text.

The outline of the book is clear and easy to follow. The book is divided into
eleven chapters and focuses on the pastoral issues the authors suggest those peri-
copes address. The authors have both practiced and studied pastoral ministry and
attempt to merge both the academic and practical aspects of it. Most laudable is the
affirmation throughout of the role of the pastor, his influence, and the importance
of his ministry. Moreover, the writing style is uncomplicated. Each chapter begins
with a translation of the passage under consideration, a section on engaging that
pericope as Scripture, followed by instructions for today’s leaders. Though oddly,
after the first chapter, the language of the final section is changed to “Congregational
Leaders” in every subsequent chapter. It is not clear if any intentional distinction is
being emphasized.

The book is not described as a commentary, so it would be unfair to hold it
up to those academic standards. However, what does become clear from the first
pages is the intent of the authors to challenge conservative interpretations of 1 and 2
Timothy. The favorite attack of the book is against the view of male pastors, repeat-
edly referring to the passages in 1 Timothy which suggest the delimitation of the
role of the pastor to males as “texts of terror” (4, 8, 58, 127). The authors asperse the
traditional view as artless, tortured, selectively applied, proof-texts of self-interest,
sinful, and fracturing to the body of Christ (8-9).

In addition to male leadership, the authors question the historicity of the text
(9) and seem conflicted over the role of Paul as author of the books of 1 and 2 Timothy. This may reflect different parts of the book as having been written by different authors, but at one point the book affirms Pauline authorship of the books (5), while at another point concludes that the author of 1 and 2 Timothy cannot be known (9–12) and merely consigning it to a matter of “tradition” (11). Most egregious for this reviewer was the reference to the discussion of the virgin birth as idle speculation (41).

Call for importance of missions (49), holy living (93), order in the church (107), the need for courage on the part of believers (160), enduring through suffering (173), and a core belief in the resurrection of Christ (186), stand out as strengths of the book and challenges for pastors and church leaders. Unfortunately, these are often overshadowed by the author’s campaign against inerrancy and the historicity of the text.

The research of the book is sometimes difficult to track. The book frequently refers to “most” or “some” scholars, but rarely backs up those statements with evidence (cf. pp. 16, 17, 45, 48, 52, 54, 58, 90, 93ff). Given that the intended target audience is pastor-scholars, the selective and limited research along with the other concerns listed here make this volume difficult to recommend.

Deron J. Biles
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

Studies in Evangelism and Missions

*Contextualization in World Missions: Mapping and Assessing Evangelical Models.*

Contextualization is a term in missions that many sending agencies, as well as individual missionaries, use to show that they have become relevant and up-to-date in both their philosophy and methodology. It shows up in purpose statements and action plans, particularly as a critique of previous approaches that now seem old-fashioned and inappropriate. Moreau takes this term and helps the reader understand how it is used across the world of missions, with particular attention to the approach of evangelicals.

Chapter 1 explores and positions evangelical contextualization within the broader contextualization discussion, pointing out the tension between an evangelical versus ecumenical approach in how the term is defined and applied. He sets the stage for an evangelical discussion by first looking at the broader perspective as illustrated in the models of Bevans and Shreiter. His concluding argument, however, is that this broader perspective does not do justice to the nuances and variations found within evangelical contextualization. Evangelicals cannot just be lumped together as though there is one uniformed approach to contextualization.

In chapters 2 and 3 Moreau raises the important issue of presuppositions. The way in which contextualization is done is directly related to the presuppositions that are brought to bear, and for evangelicals this has centered on the presupposition that biblical norms supersede any accommodations to a particular context. Moreau goes on to provide a good, detailed discussion of the challenges that are faced when bringing such presuppositions into the task of contextualization, showing that it is more complex than may initially be imagined.

Indigenization is a term that is often used interchangeably with contextu-
alization, and Moreau gives a useful comparison between the two which seems to place indigenization as an important concept within contextualization. He also raises awareness of terms such as transformation, syncretism, and holism, which are central to the current discussion on contextualization. All of this helps the reader understand a scale of contextualization that addresses a Gospel that is not contextual enough on the one end, to that which goes too far at the other end. Within these two extremes then are the various tools and methods used by evangelicals which Moreau outlines well in chapters six, seven and following. Where others have used the term catalyst for those who apply the various tools and methods, Moreau introduces the term initiator to describe these roles. Essentially, an initiator is a person or group from within or outside of the culture that begins the process of contextualization. Moreau takes time to unpack the various initiator roles which is very helpful in distinguishing between them. For the cross-cultural evangelist or church planter this helps to clarify their particular role in a specific context.

The best use of this book may be as a core textbook for a semester course on contextualization where the many aspects can be debated and discussed over time. For the individual reader working through it on their own, they may get the feeling that they are standing in front of a contextualization fire hose, with terms and approaches pouring out rapidly. There does seem to be a rising debate in missions to unreached people groups on whether to use a common ground or point of contact approach to contextualization. This would be a useful inclusion with an expanded discussion on insider movements. Another area that may be too much to expand upon and would potentially add to the pressure from the fire hose is that of the increasing role of the Global South and the decreasing role of the West in contextualization. World missions does seem to be at a crossroad in this regard where there are those who trumpet the shift as already having taken place and those who counter this with questions such as: where are the Global South seminaries, books, and churches that are informing the West? All in all, this book is a very commendable attempt to address a broad and complex subject and should be on the shelf of anyone addressing the topic of contextualization.

Dean F. Sieberhagen
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary


Pratt is the director of Global Theological Education for the International Mission Board (IMB), and he formerly was a professor at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville, Kentucky. Sills is the A.P. and Faye Stone Chair of Christian Missions and Cultural Anthropology at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. Walters is an assistant missions professor and director of the Dehoney Center for Urban Ministry Training at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

The authors’ purpose for the book is “to provide an introductory survey of the most important subjects for any missionary” (vii). They achieved this purpose by dividing the book into four sections that discuss the four areas usually addressed by missiologists: “biblical and theological foundations, history of missions, cultural studies, and practical strategies” (vii). Parts of the introduction are excerpts and adaptations from *The Missionary Call* by Sills, and several references in the book are made to *Reaching and Teaching* by Sills.
A theological divide still exists among missiologists in regard to search theology versus harvest theology. The authors propose a proper balance between the two priorities, but they note that discipleship is sometimes ignored when financial resources are lacking (28). The influence of Sills is evident here: “We are to reach and teach them, not one or the other. . . . When we do one to the exclusion of the other, we are only doing half of the Great Commission” (28).

The authors also deal with a second serious problem in missions today; they discuss the commonly-held view that Scripture is authoritative but insufficient for mission work: “Under the influence of contemporary culture, however, many professing evangelicals can affirm the inerrancy and authority of Scripture and yet fail to make any connection between what Scripture actually says and how they go about the missions enterprise” (75). The authors admit that “we can make use of knowledge from secular sources” (75), but they also state that “we need not let secular marketing techniques or the latest social science fads dictate our method” (76). This section serves as a cogent warning to those people who try to separate their theology from their missiology. Indeed, as the authors state, “Missiology is applied theology” (67).

Sills criticized parts of David Garrison’s church planting movement (CPM) model in Reaching and Teaching, but no direct criticism is evident in Introduction to Global Missions. The authors simply list Garrison’s ten factors “present in most CPMs” and then state, “While these factors present healthy guidelines for church-planting models, they are best understood with context in mind” (214). In response to Garrison’s ninth factor (“rapid reproduction”), they warn that “church planting that is too rapid may lead to churches led by pastors/elders unprepared (or unqualified) for leadership” (214).

Interestingly, the authors place significant emphasis on original/imputed guilt (38, 71, 76). They state that in Adam’s fall “all subsequent humanity descended into both actual guilt and a corrupted nature” (71) and that “his rebellion bequeathed to all his posterity both real moral guilt and all-pervasive corruption (Rom 5:12-21)” (76). Original/imputed guilt does not necessarily imply that infants dying in infancy will go to hell, but the authors missed a good opportunity to state their position on the fate of infants dying in infancy in a section with a subheading that asks a question (“Does everyone have to hear and believe the gospel to be saved?”) (83). The infant mortality issue is relevant in a missions book in regard to the motivation of seeing all people groups represented before God’s throne (Rev 7:9). For example, John Piper (Let the Nations Be Glad!) described his belief that infants dying in infancy would be in heaven, but he said that God would be honored more by Christian converts than by dead infants representing all people groups before His throne.

The authors’ belief about original/imputed guilt is consistent with Southern Baptist Theological Seminary’s Abstract of Principles, which states that Adam’s “posterity inherit a nature corrupt and wholly opposed to God and His law, are under condemnation, and as soon as they are capable of moral action, become actual transgressors.” The current Southern Baptist confession of faith (2000 Baptist Faith and Message), however, takes a different view of Adam’s descendants. It states that “as soon as they are capable of moral action, they become transgressors and are under condemnation,” and thus it describes condemnation as coming after the capacity for moral action rather than before that ability.

The huge short-term missions trend was discussed in a balanced fashion. The authors warn that the “amateurization of missions is not necessarily an advance”
In a positive note, the authors mention that short-term missionaries can “provide much-needed support that multiplies the ministry of career missionaries” and can “free others for tasks that only long-term missionaries can perform” (249).

Another hot topic for missionaries is the insider movement, and the authors correctly argue against the movement. They state, “It is dishonest for someone who believes in the Trinity, the deity of Christ, and substitutionary atonement to claim the label ‘Muslim’” (263). They provide a concise look at the insider issue and warn readers about its syncretism.

Overall, *Introduction to Global Missions* achieved its stated purpose. In a calvinistic institution, it will serve well as a basic text in an introductory missions course. In most Southern Baptist institutions, however, a combination of *The Missionary Call* and *Reaching and Teaching* will be preferred in introductory missions courses because of general applicability and direct references to Southern Baptist and IMB issues.

John Michael Morris
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

Studies in Christian Education


Following and building upon his call for a return by Christian higher education to the integration of faith and learning and the unity of knowledge in *Renewing Minds: Serving Church and Society through Christian Higher Education*, David Dockery, now president of Trinity International University, has edited this work in an effort to describe in some practical ways, the outworking of his thinking. In doing so, Dockery recruited twenty-four other contributors, twenty-two of which serve at Union University, where he formerly served as president. The other two, Kenneth Magnuson and Klaus Issler, serve at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary and Biola University, respectively.

*Faith and Learning* certainly should be read alongside *Renewing Minds*. In his introduction, Dockery built upon an abbreviated and reworked form of *Renewing Minds*, constructing his emphases upon the Great Commandment that we love God and laying the groundwork for application by the contributors into their various fields of study and teaching. Considering that *Renewing Minds* could be called a manifesto of sorts and the fact that almost every contributor taught at Union at the time of publication, *Faith and Learning* might be called a manifesto for the life and work of Union University and a practical exploration of how that looks in practice.

Dockery divided the book into three sections: Foundational Commitments, Christian Faith and the Disciplines, and Concluding Applications. Within the middle section, professors of various disciplines within the University attempted to develop Dockery’s ideas and to apply them to their respective disciplines with unequal success. As with any work of this nature, with many contributors, the chapters vary in quality and even in focus and direction, leaving the book with the typical imbalances. Using specialists in multiple fields can produce a great deal more detail, expertise, and insight. At the same time, it usually produces disconnectedness and weaker writing over the whole of the project. The brevity of this review prevents a discussion of all twenty-four chapters, but two chapters bore special interest to the reviewer, one in the first section and one in the third.
Klaus Issler’s chapter in the first section entitled simply, “Philosophy of Education,” is an excellent effort given the confinement of only twenty-one pages. His philosophy grows out of and folds back into the Bible and theology, which is not the case in every Christian philosophy of education. Of special note is Issler’s emphasis upon the work of the Holy Spirit in education and “the teaching-learning process.” An entire paragraph is worthy of note here.

The distinctively Christian factor relates to the transformational encounter with God in regeneration and God’s subsequent dynamic participation in the lives of each Christian. Along these lines, then, Christian teaching is an intentional interaction superintended by God the Holy Spirit (Rom 8:12; 1 Pet 1:2) who indwells (John 14:16) and empowers (Eph 3:16) both Christian teachers and Christian learners, with the broader goal of transformation into Christlikeness (Rom 8:29; Gal 5:22-23; Eph 4:13-16). When teachers and learners are genuinely walking with the Spirit of God, His divine, transforming power makes it possible to exceed what is normally expected of our human capacities (Gal 3:3; Eph 3:16). This divine enablement permits a greater flourishing among those with the spiritual gift of teaching (Rom 12:6-7; 1 Cor 12:28-29; 1 Pet 4:11). (98)

While the chapter moves from theology and Scripture into philosophy, it never veers from the former very far nor for very long. This is a welcome approach to the discipline.

In the third section, Thomas Rosebrough and Ralph Leverett co-authored a chapter entitled, “Faith and Transformational Teaching.” In 2011, Rosebrough and Leverett co-authored a book called Transformational Teaching in the Information Age: Making How and Why We Teach Relevant to Students.

While the chapter is well-written and provides relevant and helpful information, one could be forgiven for being confused concerning just what sort of transformation the authors seek and what faith has to do with it. No discussion of faith can be found in the chapter, and the desire to reach “spiritual goals” in teaching only resides in the first few pages. Other than a glancing reference to Galatians 5 and the gift of the Spirit, which the authors call “spiritual qualities” (477), and the mention of Jesus and Paul (“two of the most transformational figures in the Scriptures were teachers”) the chapter is void of Scripture. How Jesus could be categorized only as one of “two of the most transformational figures in the Scriptures” is simply stunning.

In the rest of the chapter, the authors quote Plato but never Jesus. They spend much time on Piaget, Vygotsky, and brain research in a chapter devoted to the relationship of faith and transformational teaching, but none on exploring what the Scriptures might add to their topic. In the interest of the integration of faith and teaching, Rosebrough and Leverett present a model that sets spiritual goals as only equal to social goals and, in their diagram, both the spiritual and social goals appear to be set below academic goals.

The connection between Dockery’s thinking and the chapter, “Philosophy of Education,” is apparent. The connection of the book’s introduction to the chapter, “Faith and Transformational Teaching,” is puzzling.

Waylan Owens
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary